# THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. VIII JUNE, 1924 No. 48

## EDITORIAL

### BISHOP GORE AND SOME YOUNGER THINKERS

With the publication of *The Holy Spirit and the Church** Dr. Gore brings to a close the task of dogmatic exposition and defence which he took in hand some three or four years ago; and we are not surprised that all three volumes have enjoyed a circulation which is unusual in the case of theological books. For Dr. Gore is without rival among present-day teachers in candour and lucidity of reasoning, in marshalling facts and arguments with telling effect, and in making us realize that he is bearing witness to a Faith which is his very life. We propose here to give some account of the last volume of the series, and to consider the relation of all three to the way in which other contemporary writers, mostly of a younger school, are attempting to treat the problems concerned.

---

Let no one suppose that Dr. Gore's book is easy reading. When a writer whose standpoint we know produces a new work upon a subject of perennial interest, we are inclined to turn to it at once for answers to those questions which are uppermost in our minds. That will probably be our first reading of it. And in the present case such an approach may well be discouraging: we speak from experience. But the fact is that Dr. Gore is dealing not with the questions that are uppermost, but with those that are deepest, in our minds; meting out to us that "unleavened bread of sincerity and truth" which needs thorough digesting: and compelling us to come at our difficulties by his way of approach, not ours. In other words, this book needs to be read twice, and especially the second time, before it can be rightly judged. It is stiffer than either of the other two, and its stiffness is its strength.

* John Murray, 1924, 7s. 6d. net.

The early chapters, which are biblical and expository, show Dr. Gore taking his stand, as always, upon Holy Scripture, and particularly upon the New Testament, as the classical and normative expression of Christian truth. He shows how the Catholic conception of the Spirit is rendered concrete and real by its embodiment in the visible Church: vindicates the claim that the Church was founded by the historic Christ in the days of His flesh: rebuts the assertions of Loisy and others that its institutions and many of its ideas were derived from the Mystery Religions: and demonstrates the Church's belief in " one body and one spirit " (Eph. iv. 4) to be that of the New Testament. On this foundation Dr. Gore builds up the principles of the Church's doctrinal authority. Its end is the Christian life; it is parental and educative rather than despotic; and it is " a restricted thing—restricted by Scripture " (p. 181). The essence of the whole matter—what Tyrrell called the " idea " of Christianity—is " a word or message of God," disclosed by Him to and through the prophets and our Lord and the Apostles, and directed to the redemption of mankind; and this essence is preserved and guarded in a double vessel —the inner one being the Bible, which originally recorded it, and the outer one being the Church, which transmits, expounds, and verifies it.

A criticism of the Roman theory of authority—all the more crushing as it is accompanied by a warm appreciation of the splendid elements in the Roman tradition—leads to a consideration of the idea of development as applied to dogma; and Dr. Gore lays it down as a postulate that " any development in the doctrine or practice of the Church which narrows it, so that it is no longer a home for men of good-will who in its earlier days would readily have found a home in it, is thereby marked as a spurious development " (p. 220). True progress, that is to say, lies not in the accumulation of dogmas but in the exercise of ever increasing " mobility," the one test of all attempts at adaptation being conformity to the mind of Holy Scripture as the inspired Word of God. And the use of Scripture is twofold. It is evidential (in which case we must bring to its study the best critical acumen that we have); and it is edifying to the soul, the latter use in particular requiring such aids to interpretation as theological tradition supplies.

Finally, Dr. Gore asks the question, " What is of faith ?" He insists that the answer should be a *minimum*, but does not seek to confine it to the clauses of the Creeds; among doctrines, that of Original Sin, and among corollaries of dogma, that

of the Apostolic Ministry, "have behind them the whole weight of Catholic authority" (p. 295). And he claims that the whole complex of beliefs so embraced, and resting upon the revelation of God which finds its climax in the Incarnation, answers satisfactorily to the test of rational coherence. The appeal to Scripture and antiquity, he says, "is involved in the fundamental principle of the finality of Christ" (p. 345). It gives us a religion which is substantially identical in different ages and amid different peoples, and has been verified in the experience of all. This religion offers us a way of life which satisfies the moral consciousness and has still great possibilities unexplored. And it can stand at the bar of reason unabashed, certain that all reverent and unprejudiced enquiry, whether into its historical origins or into its ultimate beliefs, will but serve to confirm its truth.

---

The point from which we propose to consider this remarkable book is, as has been stated, its relation to the work of other contemporary, and younger, thinkers in the same field; and we are the more anxious to do so because Dr. Gore himself makes so little reference in this direction. We have in mind particularly the work of Mr. Spens,* Mr. Rawlinson,† and Mr. R. D. Richardson.‡ All of them may be regarded as inspired, as Dr. Gore is, by the vision of "a Church which undeniably gives full weight to Catholic experience, as well as to honesty of thought";§ and each of them, in one way or another, may be said to carry Dr. Gore's work a stage further. In reviewing *Belief in God* in this journal,|| Mr. Spens urged that the fundamental task of apologetic was to justify those intuitive affirmations on which religious no less than scientific belief is found to rest; and his book was largely an amplification of that theme. Father Thornton, of Mirfield, reviewing *Belief in Christ*, voiced the same judgment.¶ The need that is felt is of a conception of authority which shall take fully into account the "non-rational" elements in religious experience. Dr. Gore's own exposition leaves room for this. He admits, for example, the great success of Roman Catholicism in producing saintliness of character, while insisting quite rightly on the large admixture of error in its system. That is a paradox which calls for explanation; and, if it be followed up, we think that it will be found to bring into prominence certain factors of the problem which are vital to a complete view.

* *Belief and Practice* (Longmans, 1915).

† *Authority and Freedom* (Longmans, 1924, 7s. 6d. net).

‡ *The Causes of the Present Conflict of Ideals in the Church of England* (Murray, 1923).

§ *Belief and Practice*, p. 239.

|| THEOLOGY, IV., pp. 235 ff.

¶ *Ibid.*, VI., 172 ff.

Mr. Richardson's book belongs to a series entitled The Modern Churchman's Library, and we have read it both with profit and pleasure. It is a historical survey of those points of stress in the conception of religious authority which have been most to the fore in Anglican thought since the Reformation. He distinguishes two external sources of authority—the Church and the Bible—and three inward sources, which he calls the rational, moral, and spiritual consciousness respectively. In effect, these last three may be subsumed under the broad category of the conscience; and the problem is the balance which should obtain between Church, Bible, and conscience in the formation and guidance of religious belief. It is interesting to find how nearly allied are different minds when the problem is so put. We find, for example, Sir Thomas Browne writing:

> In brief, where the Scripture is silent, the Church is my text; where that speaks, 'tis but my comment; where there is a joint silence of both I borrow not the rules of my Religion from Rome or Geneva, but the dictates of my own reason (*Religio Medici*, i. 5.)

And Cardinal Newman, quoted approvingly by Bishop Gore:

> Certainly, if I am obliged to bring religion into after-dinner toasts . . . I shall drink—to the Pope, if you please—still, to conscience first, and to the Pope afterwards.

And Mr. Richardson, who might be, but is not, summarizing Dr. Gore's method:

> [Reason] does not *normally* decide to substitute itself for the other religious authorities, but only to demonstrate their rationality, though a conscious preference for an intellectual satisfaction with regard to the claims of other authorities does show " the influence of a certain ideal as to the relative importance of different parts of our nature " (*op. cit.*, p. 19).

---

Mr. Richardson agrees with Dr. Gore that " the distinctive position of the Church of England was reached by going back to the New Testament for its doctrine and to the primitive Church for its practice " (*op. cit.*, p. 34); and with Mr. Rawlinson that " the great problem which the Church of England has yet to solve " is " the relation between authority and freedom " (p. 25). *Authority and Freedom* is the title of Mr. Rawlinson's Paddock Lectures. They are well written, as we could be sure they would be, and abound in valuable things: such, for instance, as the passage on what the Kingdom of God meant for our Lord (pp. 80-84)—a passage which brushes aside volumes of popular verbiage; or the chapter on Sacramental Religion, with its judicious estimate of what extra-liturgical devotions do—and do not—portend; or the emphasis, as against Liberal Protestant-

ism, on Christianity as "the religion of the search of God for man" (p. 104). The point, however, to which we wish to draw attention here is Mr. Rawlinson's attitude to the element of historical fact in the Christian Faith. This is a point on which Dr. Gore never leaves us in any doubt whatever. He regards belief in certain historical facts as essential to orthodox faith; and among these he would include, not only the facts recited in the Creed, but also (unless we are mistaken) such facts as our Lord's institution of the Eucharist and of the hierarchy. At the same time Dr. Gore insists that assurance as to these facts having happened is to be reached by the ordinary methods of historical enquiry. And the difficulty he leaves us with is as to how a belief which rests, if not for its first acceptance, yet for its secure maintenance, upon a highly complicated process of criticism can be essential to everlasting salvation. Free enquiry means the possibility of a man in all good faith coming down on the wrong side of the fence; and it is his duty to do so, if his reason guides him that way: and yet the result may be infinitely disastrous.

---

To some extent Mr. Rawlinson deals with this dilemma. He insists that from the moment of our Lord's Resurrection the Church appears as possessed already in germ of "the three fundamental elements of ecclesiastical Catholicism—dogma, hierarchy, and sacrament" (p. 143). But he is prepared not to insist that we must believe the last two at any rate to have been deliberately founded by our Lord as permanent institutions for the future. He celebrated the Eucharist, for instance, in the Upper Room; but it is not certain that He gave the command to repeat it. In such a case the fact that the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, did repeat it and did believe that in doing so it was carrying out His will, is what matters. We accept it, in short, not because of a historical certainty, but on the authority of the Church.

---

But how far is Mr. Rawlinson prepared to carry this principle? It is essentially the principle which underlies the Catholic Modernism of Father Tyrrell; and Tyrrell, in his later works, was prepared to carry it right through and apply it to the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection. Mr. Rawlinson does not do that; but it is not quite clear why not. It is not quite clear, for example, whether he regards the historical Virgin Birth as guaranteed by the authority of the Church. He is far more adequate, in fact, in what he says of Freedom than in

what he says of Authority. We do not complain of this; nor do we believe that Dr. Gore could complain on the basis of his own principles. But we cannot rest in it. It is a sign that we have not yet got to the bottom of the matter. We can see that Rome is wrong, and why. We cannot yet produce a decisive, because an obviously embracing, alternative.

---

The above books—including, in certain of its aspects, Mr. Richardson's—all belong to that Liberal Catholicism which we believe to be, alike in life and in thought, the genius of the English Church. In the balance and interpoise of its constituent elements, some will lay especial stress on the adjective, others on the noun. But there are increasing signs on both sides of a disposition to recognize not only the contribution of the other, but also the need of finding a synthesis on some deeper level than has yet been reached. Further, the discussion is attracting the contributions of thinkers like the Bishop of Ripon, whose reputation is already established in other fields of theology.* We see no sign in this process of any weakening of the Faith, such as Liberal Protestantism seems always to involve. Rather the tendency is towards new formulations which will undercut existing dilemmas and go far to strengthen Catholicism not only here, but in the Eastern and Roman Churches as well.

---

## NOTE

Among contributors to this number, Professor A. E. Taylor is Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of St. Andrews; Dr. Lowther Clarke was formerly Archbishop of Melbourne; and Dr. Joyce is Chancellor of the Diocese of St. Asaph. Mr. Shebbeare, Rector of Stanhope (for twelve years the home of Bishop Butler), is well known for his philosophical work.

---

We have received from the Rev. H. A. Boys a copy of an article by him on the Kalendar, reprinted from *The Christian East* of February last. He points out some difficulties in the way of a fixed Easter.

* His lecture entitled *Authority* was briefly noticed in our April issue, and a further book of his is noticed to-day. We shall hope to return to these in a later number, together with Canon Quick's *Catholic and Protestant Elements in Christianity*, and Dr. Carnegie Simpson's *Church Principles*.

# THE GOSPEL OF LIFE: A STUDY IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

## II.—THE BACKGROUND

THE story of the ministry at Jerusalem begins, like the story of the ministry in Galilee, with the preaching of St. John the Baptist.

But, in the case of the ministry at Jerusalem, the ministry of the Baptist, besides having a very special connection with the story, has also a very special connection with the record. It has a special connection with the story, because a definite reason is supplied why the ministry of the Baptist should be the beginning of the ministry of Christ. We are explicitly told that the first disciples of our Lord had been the Baptist's disciples before they were His, and that they came to Him under the impulse of the witness of the Baptist. It has a special connection with the record, because we are told what was in the background of the acceptance of our Lord by the disciples to whom we owe the record of the Gospel which was preached to and rejected by the Jews of Jerusalem.

If there is any truth at all in the story of the Fourth Gospel, we must believe, as we have said, that our Lord approached Jerusalem with a Gospel in His mind which He should deliver to *them* as He could deliver it to no one else, and that, even in their rejection of His Gospel, they had qualifications for understanding it which were wanting in the Galilean converts. They were sensitive to the truths about God with which the new Gospel seemed to conflict. Their minds were full of the distinctively Jewish apprehension of the unique and unapproachable majesty of Jehovah, from which they were to have been led on to the new revelation of His forgiveness and His love. But they lacked the spiritual qualification which would have enabled them to make the advance. If they had been the only hearers, there would have been no one to record how their very opposition became the occasion for the emergence from our Lord's mind of the Gospel with which he felt Himself to be charged. We have the record, because there was standing by one at least of those who had the spiritual qualification to understand and to accept the gift which He came to give and the truths which He came to proclaim.

This spiritual qualification was the sense of sin, which the disciples of the Baptist had learnt from their master.

Every new truth demands a certain condition in those who are to accept it. It cannot be proclaimed *in vacuo*. It

must bear a definite relation to the mind of the hearer. The spiritual condition of accepting the Gospel of life was that which the whole Old Testament training was intended to supply. It was that deep consciousness of sin, that passionate longing for divine renewal, which breathes for us still in the Psalms.

Whether our Lord spoke the actual words, "Behold the Lamb of God," does not concern our immediate purpose. Our point is that the Fourth Gospel tells us that those who alone understood the Gospel preached to the Jews of Jerusalem came to it prepared by the sense of sin and the longing for deliverance.

The sense of sin was vital throughout to the writer's apprehension of the Gospel, of the conditions of its acceptance, and of the tragedy of its rejection. It is worth while to note the places in the story which bring home to us the presence of this dark background of the drama. They are not inserted of set purpose: they occur as casual indications of a consciousness which is present throughout of a darkness illumined and stabbed through by rays of intense and dazzling light.

1. *The Preface.*—It is because (i. 5) "the light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness apprehended* it not," that "John came," John, the preacher of repentance, to bear witness of the light, that through him, the preacher of repentance, all might believe. He stands for the essential condition of belief, the recognition of sin, the cause of the darkness, alike in the world that knew him not, and in his own that received him not.

2. And so *the witness of John* was the witness to One who stood among them (i. 26), whom they knew not. That was his unconscious forecast of the nature of the manifestation of Him who was to come, and was come.

3. *The first disciples* pass from the Baptist to Jesus, because John pointed Him out (i. 29) as "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." And among these first disciples one is distinguished (i. 47) "in whom is no guile," in whom the blinding power of sin has not prevailed.

4. *The purging of the Temple* at the opening of the ministry at Jerusalem is a prophetic act, challenging notorious sin, the sin of the rulers, who, at the very threshold of the approach to God, had set up a barrier built by avarice and the love of gain. The challenge was not taken up, the rebuke called forth no response but the barren question as to His external authority to administer a rebuke, which was indeed its own authority.

* This appears to me to be the rendering which the context imperatively demands.

The moral darkness was too deep to be conscious that it was pierced by the light.

5. In *the discourse with Nicodemus* the vital point was that he did not feel that need of a new life which only the consciousness of sin could give. To the Evangelist, at any rate, it is plain that the lifting up of the Son of man to heal the sin of the world would give no revelation of the love with which God loved the world to those who, by not believing in Him, judged themselves to be blinded by the darkness of sin.

6. *The Baptism of John.*—On leaving Jerusalem we find our Lord and His disciples on the borders of Judæa, apparently carrying on and continuing the baptism of John. The two ministries seem to be proceeding side by side. Our Lord's disciples, under His sanction, are baptising as John baptised, with the baptism of repentance. Only gradually does our Lord's ministry begin to stand out as distinct, so that the Pharisees hear (iv. 1) that He is making and baptising more disciples than John. This gives the immediate motive for His departure from Judæa.

7. On *the passage through Samaria*, on the way to Galilee, the Samaritan woman, who seems to respond to the offer of life, is checked and driven back on a deeper sense of her need by the question as to her past life, which reveals Jesus as the discerner of sin. It is by this that her acceptance of His offer must be tested. And it is because He told her all that ever she did (iv. 39) that through her He draws the Samaritans to Him.

8. At *the Unknown Feast*, the impotent man is bidden to "go and sin no more" (v. 14). The miracle of healing is interpreted as an incident in God's work of salvation from sin.

And the failure of "the Jews" to recognize this healing as the work of the Father shows that they have not His Word abiding in them, as their dependence on mutual self-approval accounts for their not welcoming one who was entirely dependent on the Father's will.

9. In *the conflict in Galilee*, whither "the Jews" followed Him, the underlying cause of unbelief, though we feel it to be at work throughout, does not appear upon the surface until the tragic moment, when the poison of their presence is felt to penetrate the very inner body of His chosen: "Did I not choose you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" (vi. 70).

10. The controversies of *the Feast of Tabernacles* throw light repeatedly on the underlying ethical cause of unbelief. The judgment passed is not on unbelief itself, but on the

ethical condition of which unbelief was the inevitable consequence.*

vii. 7: The world hateth Me "because I testify of it, that its works are evil." Sin (*cf.* iii. 19) instinctively shrinks from the light that lighteth every man.

vii. 17: "If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the truth whether it be of God." The condition of belief is the antecedent moral attitude of the soul quite independent of the question of belief, the attitude of loyal dependence on the will of God.

vii. 18: "He that speaketh of himself, seeketh his own glory, but he that seeketh the glory of Him that sent him the same is true." The test of truth is seen in the contrast between the self-seeking temper of those who live for the applause of men and him who seeks the glory of Him that sent him.

vii. 19: "Why seek ye to kill Me?" Their inveterate hate in itself condemns them.

viii. 21 and 24: "Ye shall die in your sins." The inevitable judgment on the sin in unbelief finds more and more relentless expression.

viii. 28: "When ye have lifted up the Son of man ye shall know." The parallel phrase in xii. 33 shows that to the Evangelist the words were a prophecy of the exaltation which came of the crime of the Cross.

viii. 34: "Every one that committeth sin is the slave of sin." The freedom with which "the truth shall make you free" is primarily the freedom from the bondage of sin in which they were held, only so opening the way to the freedom of the Son which is contrasted with the bondage of the slave.

viii. 38-44: "Ye do the things which ye have learnt of your father the devil. . . . Ye are of your father the devil."

The spirit of unbelief is the working of the very spirit of evil.

11. *The Healing of the Man born Blind.*—ix. 41: Jesus said unto them, "If ye were blind, ye would have no sin: but now ye say, We see; your sin remaineth." At this significant moment, when He receives into the fellowship of believers him whom the Pharisees had cast out, He pronounces the final doom upon the blindness of sin, sealed as it is by their self-confidence that they see.

12. This *issue* is endorsed by the Evangelist, xii. 37 *ff.*, with the quotation from Isaiah, which pronounces the self-inflicted blindness of sin to be the judgment of God on the sin that blinds the eyes and hardens the heart.

* *Cf.* H. S. Holland, *The Fourth Gospel: Note on the Philosophy of Unbelief*, pp. 151-2 (Murray, 1923).

## III.—THE NEW BIRTH

The scene at Cana is professedly only a prelude to the public ministry. The ministry begins with the visit to Jerusalem at the Feast of the Passover. The story of that visit gives us, in the discourse with Nicodemus, the first utterance of the Gospel to Jerusalem.

It was, then, at the commemoration of the birth of the nation in a great deliverance that our Lord is represented as making His first appeal to the national conscience at the centre and home of the national religion.

It was in the Temple, the one home of the worship of the Jew, that He found that which provoked His appeal. At the very threshold of the worship of God He claimed a unique right to vindicate the purity of worship from the contaminating influence of a religious market. The claim was not, as a claim, so high as the claim made almost at the beginning of the Galilean ministry, the claim of authority to forgive sins, but the purpose of the claim, to purify the national worship, emphasized the appeal to the national conscience to repudiate an abuse for which the rulers were directly responsible.

It is, therefore, the more striking that the appeal produced no response, no welcome from the people of an assertion of their right to free themselves from association with an official sin, no defence from the authorities of the religious character which His act impugned. The only response to His attack was that He was challenged to show a "sign" to establish His authority to do what He had done. The answer He is represented as making would have been, as it would have been intended to be, enigmatical to those to whom it was addressed.

The act, in fact, was its own authority. It justified itself. That it should pass unnoticed by welcome from the people was a sign of the moral deadness which is the main impression, material to our present purpose, which is left by the story.

A similar impression is left by the brief and pregnant record of the rest of His ministry in Jerusalem.

"Many believed on His name, beholding His signs which He did."

"But Jesus did not trust Himself unto them, for that He knew all men."

It would seem that the disciple who records the story was surprised. The record, at any rate, leaves, and must have been intended to leave, a question in the mind of the reader. Why did He not "trust Himself unto them"? What was wrong with their belief in His name? There was some fatal defect

in their faith, there was some fatal defect in the moral character and attitude of Jerusalem. What was it?

The prophetic act of the purging of the Temple had evoked no spiritual response. The signs which He did in Jerusalem during the feast evoked a response which His own action condemned as worthless and inadequate. Wherein was it worthless and inadequate? What was the fatal want in the mind of Jerusalem?

The discourse with Nicodemus gives us the answer. It is the very spiritual deadness of Jerusalem which calls forth the first utterance of the Gospel to Jerusalem, an utterance addressed to a single representative of the ruling class, himself not without his share of the mind which blinded the class to which he belonged.

The key to the discourse with Nicodemus is given to us in the abrupt contrast between that which Nicodemus expects and that which is offered to him, or perhaps one should rather say that which is demanded of him. Our Lord brushes aside Nicodemus's recognition of Him as a teacher. Assuming that the real end to be attained is to be found in the Kingdom of God, He lays down that the one qualification for entry into the Kingdom of God is the sense of the need of a new birth. With this need the teacher of Israel should have been familiar. It is to this that the Old Testament teaching should have led him.

Our Lord Himself, no doubt, *was* a Teacher in the Old Testament sense. He shows Himself in this character in the Sermon on the Mount, insisting on and deepening the demand of spiritual obedience which the law developed, and of which the prophets and the Psalms are full. So here He is formulating the demand for the issue of this teaching in the sense of need of a new life, coming, like birth, as a creative gift from God.

Given this, He becomes again a Teacher in a new sense, and, in the Sermon on the Mount, He exhibits Himself in this character also, opening out the new truth, the new life, to which the new-born will be led in the experience of the spirit.

But before He can become in fact to any believer a Teacher in this sense, He must have been recognized as the Giver of the new birth, the Giver of the new life of the Spirit. This was the vital element in His message. And for this the sense of need must be there, for only in response to the sense of need can the gift be given.

To the teacher of Israel the culminating prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel had brought their message of the hope of the new covenant—" I will put my law in their inward parts,

and in their heart will I write it" (Jer. xxxi. 33). "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you. . . . And I will put my spirit within you, and ye shall live" (Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27, and xxxvii. 14). They were prophecies of the gift of the new life of the Spirit.

The new word in our Lord's great utterance is "birth." The new gift will be a birth, a new beginning of the whole life. Like the physical birth, it will be a gift of God, and the gift will be to be the child of God. But here it is the absolute new beginning which is insisted on, the spring, at the very source, of the life that comes into being like the birth of a child.

It is to be a new birth of water and the Spirit. The baptism of John, the baptism with water, symbolical of that promise of the forgiveness of sins with which all the prophecies of the new life of the Spirit had been prefaced, this is to be merged in the baptism with the Spirit which had descended on the Christ Himself after He had undergone the prophetic baptism of John. The gift of forgiveness, symbolized and foretold in the baptism of John, will be actually given in the gift of the new birth.

It is to be a new birth of the Spirit as contrasted with the flesh. It will be the beginning of a new life coming from without, not accounted for or originating in anything in the nature of the human being who receives it. It will be mysterious, unaccountable, as in its origin, so in its manifestations. Those that receive it will be subject to new impulses; they will explain and justify themselves when they come, but, like all experiences, they will begin as experiences. There will be an arrival, a new element in life. There will be something added, something contributed, to the life of humanity.

All this the teacher of Israel should have reached out after, for this he should have been prepared, under the pressure of the sense of need of new life from God, bred under the discipline of the law.

And this new arrival of life is announced, as alone it could be announced, from heaven, from whence it comes.

But if you do not know the earthly thing, the incapacity of the flesh, the human need, how can you know the heavenly thing, the gift of life from God?

So we return to the sense of need—the want of which was the fatal want in the Jew of Jerusalem.

We pass from the "heavenly things," the character of the Gospel to be delivered, to Himself as the only one by whom it can be delivered, who has descended out of heaven. And it appears that He who delivers the Gospel of life is one who, though man, comes from the heavenly sphere.

Then follows the first of three references in the Gospel to the exaltation of the Son of man through the Cross (as it is interpreted in xii. 32) as the source of eternal life. And the gift of the Son to be, by His death, the Giver of eternal life to man is referred back to the love of God who "so loved the world" as to send His Son, not to judge the world, but to save the world. The judgment is but the inevitable judgment which he who does not believe passes on himself, the judgment on the character, of which his unbelief is the manifestation. And the instinctive shrinking of sin from the light is the unconscious motive of unbelief.

He retires from Jerusalem into Judæa. The retirement seems to mark the definite abandonment of Jerusalem as the main scene of the ministry which was to be the foundation of the work that He was to fulfil in the world, and the retirement from Jerusalem is followed, after an interval, by the retirement from Judæa, and the journey through Samaria to Galilee, where, in contrast with the Jews of Jerusalem and Judæa, "the Galileans received Him."*

The sojourn in Judæa is described in iii. 22-36. The baptism by the disciples of Jesus is apparently of the nature of the Johannine baptism, and some rivalry began to arise between the disciples of the two teachers. This rivalry leads to a further witness to Jesus from the Baptist, and is followed by a comment of the Evangelist, emphasizing, with evident reference to the latter part of the discourse with Nicodemus, the heavenly and divine origin of Jesus, and once more marking eternal life as the issue of belief in Him, the Son.

The journey through Samaria on the way to Galilee takes us to the discourse with the woman of Samaria. This forms no part of the Gospel preached to Jerusalem which is our subject. But it indicates the thoughts which were in His mind as He turned His back on Jerusalem, and these we see to be the subjects with which He had been engaged at Jerusalem, the gift of life, and the purity of spiritual worship. The Samaritans were not Jews. Our Lord emphasizes (iv. 28) the real spiritual privilege of the Jew which the Samaritans did not share. Neither were they Gentiles, to whom, *e.g.*, the promise and expectation of the Messiah were unknown. But in dealing with them our Lord was so far face to face with the purely human need, that He was not hampered by the popular Jewish

* We may note, in leaving the record of the first stage of the ministry at Jerusalem, the recurrence to the reference to the giving of eternal life as the purpose of His mission. In iii. 14, the Son of man is to be lifted up, that whosoever believeth may in Him have eternal life. In iii. 16, God gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should have eternal life. It is plain that, to the Evangelist, the preaching of the new birth is the first step in the proclamation of the Gospel of life.

prejudice or convention as to the expectation of the Messiah as an earthly king, the expectation which, in His Galilean teaching, kept in the background any claim of the Messianic character.

The figure under which our Lord makes his spontaneous offer of life to the woman, the water of life, is suggested here by Jacob's well, as at the Feast of Tabernacles it is suggested by the ceremonial pouring out of water in memory of the striking of the rock. The spiritual significance of the offer is driven clean home at once by the command, "Go, call thy husband," taking her back, as we have already noted, to the sins of her past and present life.

And when she evades the test, by a reference to the difference between Jew and Samaritan as to the place for the worship of God, we pass to the second subject of the discourse. The distinctive character of Jewish worship was not to be found in the place of worship. (We are reminded of the teaching by which St. Stephen provoked his martyrdom.) It was to be found in the Spirit, it was the worship of those who knew God.

Once more she evades the direct bearing of His words, to appeal to the spiritual authority of the coming Messiah. And this appeal to the spiritual authority of the Messiah evokes the plain claim of the Messianic character, which surprises us so much by its contrast with the strict reserve of the Galilean ministry, but is accounted for by the absence in Samaria of the condition which dictated reserve in Galilee. An almost equally surprising apprehension of the wider significance of the work of the Messiah is contained in the words of the Samaritan believers (iv. 42), "We know that this is indeed the Saviour of the world." And in the intervening talk with the disciples this ministry, if we may call it so, in Samaria is alluded to as an anticipation of a harvest hereafter to be gathered in.

At the end of this episode we leave Jesus in Galilee. Of the Galilean ministry, the importance of which is emphasized by the summary description, "the Galileans received Him," we are given only one representative story, characteristically a story of need inspiring faith. It was in the sense of need that Jerusalem had failed. It was the sense of need which was the element of hope in Galilee.

From the end of the talk with Nicodemus up to this point we have been engaged with the setting of the story of the Gospel to Jerusalem, rather than with the preaching of the Gospel itself. But the setting of the story helps to throw the story itself into relief, and reflects light upon the record of the Gospel itself.

Now He has turned His back upon Jerusalem. He has come to His own, and His own have received Him not. He has

given the supreme instance of the truth that a prophet has no honour in his own country. If there had been, as surely there should have been, a possibility that the Church of Jerusalem should grow into the Universal Church of the Christ, that possibility had now passed away. He turned to Galilee to build a new structure on new foundations. With the story of the Galilean ministry the Evangelist is not concerned. Elsewhere, as here, he assumes it, and directly or indirectly alludes to it, but it is the story of the ministry at Jerusalem that he is concerned to supply.

But if Jerusalem is already rejected, or has already rejected herself, how comes it that Jerusalem is the scene of any further ministry?

We have already given the answer to this question. There was a Gospel to be preached to Jerusalem which could be preached nowhere else. The preaching of it was not to be evoked by any readiness of Jerusalem to receive it, rather it was to be provoked by her unreadiness to receive it. But in Jerusalem it was to be preached, whether she would hear or whether she would forbear.

Even the story of the ministry in Galilee needed this story of the ministry in Jerusalem to supplement and explain it. Throughout the ministry in Galilee we feel Jerusalem as a hostile force in the background, manifesting itself now and again on the Galilean scene itself. And we should be compelled to ask, even if there were no answer to the question, How did our Lord deal with this hostile influence at its source, before the final struggle and the final issue which the Galilean Gospels record?

But it was necessary that Jerusalem herself, even by her rejection, should call forth the utterance of the Gospel which she had been destined and prepared to receive, even though it would involve the tragic paradox that the Gospel of life should be preached to those who were spiritually dead.

And this tragical contrast, between the Gospel of life and the spiritually dead to whom it is preached, is turned before our eyes into the glory of a transcendent revelation.

There was present one disciple at least who heard, and remembered, and brooded over the remembrance, and understood. "To them that received Him gave He power to become sons of God." And to him who recorded the story there was given a gift which belongs to him alone. As the record proceeds we see him passing on his way, like one passing from court to court of the heavenly temple, absorbed, transfigured by the contemplation of that which he beholds and reveals.

WILFRID RICHMOND.

## INVOCATION IN THE HOLY EUCHARIST

THE attraction of the second alternative form of Canon adopted provisionally under the influence of the Grey Book supporters is felt by many who, like myself, have celebrated in Scotch Episcopal Churches with the revised Liturgy, and desire with all their hearts a revision of our Canon. Indeed, a powerful argument adduced in its favour is precisely this, that the daughter Churches of Scotland and South Africa have given us a lead in liturgical reform which it would be disastrous to reject. The inclusion of the invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Scotch Liturgy is a direct legacy from the Nonjurors. They anticipated the cordial relations with the Holy Orthodox Church of the East which are our happiness to-day. Surely if the work of the Holy Spirit, who was instrumental in the Virginal Conception of our Lord, who led Him into the wilderness to be tempted, as to the Cross, were solemnly glorified before the Father in this most solemn moment of our worship, it would help all to realize that the whole action of the sacred mysteries proceeds in the heavenly sphere, that the transformation of the Holy Bread into the Holy Body is to be understood in a spiritual sense, and freed from the implications which an obsolete system of metaphysics has bound up with it.

Such thoughts were very attractive to me some years ago, but I have come to regard the whole subject from a different point of view, and I desire to plead for the single alternative Canon on the lines laid down by the Dean of Wells.

Dom F. Cabrol in his article "Épiclèse"* makes the useful suggestion that we should distinguish in our minds between the ideas of an *epiclesis* in the strict sense—that is, a consecrating *epiclesis* with invocation of the Holy Spirit for the conversion of the elements, which is not universal—and an allusion to the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist, which we find in one form or another in almost all the liturgies, a general *epiclesis*.

In view of the disagreement of the experts about the date at which a particular invocation of the Holy Spirit was inserted in the Western Liturgy, I venture to bring forward a new point which lies behind the whole controversy.

In the fifth century, when the lines of Eastern and Western teaching on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit began to diverge more clearly, St. Augustine brought men to the edge of the later controversy about the procession of the Spirit from the Son. As Mgr. Duchesne pointed out, the real inwardness of the

* *Dict. d'Archéologie chrétienne*, v. 176.

differing points of view is the fact that the East and the West began from opposite sides of the problem. The Greek Fathers started from the thought of the Eternal Distinctions (*Hypostaseis*) in the Holy Trinity, and reconciled them as best they could with the idea of Divine Unity. They thought of the doctrine of the Trinity as an explanation of the Creation, manifested in the work of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. On the other hand, Western teachers began with the idea of the Trinity as "a necessity of the Divine Life—to use a technical term, as immanent, an abiding reality." They began from the thought of the *co-inherence* of the Divine Persons, as the Lord taught: "*Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee*" (John xvii. 21). This led them to the thought that the Spirit must be regarded as proceeding in a sense from the Son, because He is "*the Spirit of Jesus*" (Acts xvi. 7).

The question I want to put is this—which of these two lines of thought corresponds more closely with the primitive thought of the Church in devotions? I cannot doubt that it is the Western. The Consecration Prayer was always addressed to God the Father, and the first effort to express more clearly the doctrine of the Person and Work of the Holy Spirit was on that line.

Is not this clear in the teaching of the Apologist Athenagoras, in whose *Plea* (A.D. 176–180), to quote Dr. Swete, "a serious attempt is made for the first time to give something like a philosophy of the trinitarian belief of the Church."

"Let no one count it absurd that God should have a Son. . . . The Son is the Word of God the Father, both in thought and also in working; from Him and through Him all things had their beginning, the Father and the Son being one. The Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son by the unity and power of the Spirit; whence the Son of God is the Father's Mind and Word. Moreover, the Holy Spirit that works in those that deliver prophetic utterances we affirm to be an effluence of God, flowing forth and returning to Him like a ray of the sun. Who, then, can fail to be perplexed when he hears the name of atheists given to men who hold the Father to be God, and the Son God, and the Holy Spirit, pointing out the power that lies in their unity, and the distinction in their order?"*

"The one ambition that urges us Christians on is the desire to know the true God and the Word that is from Him—what is the unity of the Son with the Father, what the fellowship of the Father with the Son, what is the Spirit? What is the unity of these mighty Powers, and the distinction that exists between them, united as they are—the Spirit, the Son, the Father?"†

To quote Dr. Swete again:

"It is impossible not to observe how near Athenagoras comes to the Catholic dogma of the Holy Trinity as it was ultimately defined. He

* Athenag., *Leg.* 10. † *Ibid.*, *Leg.* 12.

anticipates to a remarkable degree the answer which the Church in the next century returned to those who insisted on the 'monarchy' of God; he sees that plurality of persons in God is not inconsistent with the idea of 'monarchy,' but complementary to it. There is unity in the Divine life, and there is also diversity. The unity consists in the possession of the same Divine power; the diversity in a distinction of rank or order. Of 'essence' or 'person' we hear nothing as yet, but a doctrine not very different from the later *circumincessio* seems to come into sight, when we are told that the Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father, 'by unity and power of spirit.'"

We need not discuss the crude idea which Athenagoras held of mechanical inspiration. That does not affect the argument that he gives us a clue to the interpretation of the devotions of the early Church. In days when the presiding Bishop of the congregation was free to make the great Thanksgiving in his own words, it was in the power of the Spirit through the Son that he and his people approached the Father. We can go behind Justin Martyr to the prayers of Clement of Rome which, with Bishop Lightfoot, we may safely regard as Eucharistic:

"As the chief pastor of the Roman Church would be the main instrument in moulding the liturgy, the prayers without being written down would assume in his mind a fixity as time went on. When, therefore, at the close of his epistle he asks his readers to fall on their knees and lay down their jealousies and disputes at the footstool of grace, his language naturally runs with those antithetical forms and measured cadences which his ministrations in the Church had rendered habitual with him when dealing with such a subject."

We may note that the character of the invocation of God is closely parallel to the well-known quotation from Justin Martyr. Clement writes:

"We will ask, with instancy of prayer and supplication, that the Creator of the Universe may guard intact unto the end the number that hath been numbered of His elect throughout the world, through His beloved Son Jesus Christ. . . . Grant unto us, Lord, that we may set our hope on Thy Name, which is the primal source of all creation, and open the eyes of our hearts, that we may know Thee, who alone abidest Highest in the highest, Holy in the holy . . . (who) hast chosen out from all men those that love Thee through Jesus Christ Thy beloved Son, through whom Thou didst instruct us, didst sanctify us, didst honour us."*

The doxology runs:

"O Thou, who alone art able to do these things and things far more exceeding good than these for us, we praise Thee through the High-Priest

* Clement, *Ep.* 59.

and Guardian of our souls, Jesus Christ, through whom be the glory and the majesty unto Thee, both now and for all generations and for ever and ever. Amen."*

The reference to the Holy Spirit in chap. 46: "Have we not one God and one Christ and one Spirit of grace that was shed upon us?" sufficiently indicates the fact that Clement was consciously praying "in the Spirit" to the Father through the Son, in complete harmony with St. Paul's teaching.

I would urge that the thought of the sub-Apostolic Age on New Testament lines concentrated in devotion on the thought of the immanent rather than the economic Trinity, on the line developed in Western rather than Eastern liturgies, and that we shall do well to follow them. This does not imply any reflection on the value of the doctrine which more precisely defined the work of the Son in our Redemption, and of the Spirit in our Sanctification. This is, indeed, the case in our present Consecration Prayer, and if, as in the first alternative Canon now proposed to the Church Assembly, further mention is made of the Lord's Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension, and then of the Spirit's work in us as we offer ourselves in union with our Lord's Sacrifice, full justice will be done to the subsequent illumination of the mind of the Church in the third and fourth centuries.

But with the editor of THEOLOGY (p. 63) I deplore the decision to cut out of the Canon the quotation from the ancient prayer, *Supplices te rogamus*, which in the Western rite takes the place of the petition for the descent of the Spirit upon the oblation:

". . . and command these our prayers and supplications by the ministry of Thy holy Angel to be brought up into Thy holy Tabernacle, in the sight of Thy Divine Majesty."

In the *de Sacramentis*, now regarded as a North Italian rite of the fifth century, the plural "angels" is found, and seems to indicate that we must not explain the words "thy Holy Angel" as a reference to our Lord's High-Priestly mediation in heaven, or with other writers as a reference to the Holy Spirit. They link up our thoughts with the Sursum Corda and the Sanctus; they point us away from earth to heaven. We are no longer in the Upper Chamber with our Lord as in the days of His flesh, but aspire to worship the Father through Him with all the citizens of heaven.

Bishop John Wordsworth held it reasonable to suppose that the Recital of the Institution "was at first considered descriptive rather than effective," and wished for the restoration

* Clement, *Ep.* 61.

of the prayer *Supplices te rogamus* with some modification of its ambiguous wording.

"It would have been a great help to our devotions if the prayer could have been so transformed as to convey the true and full idea without uncertain phraseology. It would, I venture to think, have, by its very mystery, suitable to this wonderful action, supported the existing tone of the Office."*

In regard of the well-known quotation from Justin, "we have been taught that the food which has become Eucharist by means of the word of prayer which comes from Him," Bishop Wordsworth quotes the interesting suggestion of Dr. Waterland, that "Justin may mean the prayer at this moment uttered by Christ:—'Might not he mean that Christ our High Priest alone now ratifies what He once said on earth. . . . It is he that *now* sanctifies the symbols as he *then* did, and, as it were, presides over our Eucharistical services, etc.'† It is striking to find this doctrine, which I believe to be essentially the true one, in a writer so solemn as Waterland, even though it is not probable that Justin meant it here."‡

The reference to Christ as our High Priest in Clement's doxology, which I have quoted above, shows how closely this line of thought follows primitive devotions.

Thus we pass to our final doxology, in which again we follow Justin's thought of the offering up "praise and glory to the Father of all things, through the name of the Son and the Holy Spirit," and let us be content with the teaching of the Western Church. To quote Bishop Wordsworth again: "Beautiful as the Oriental Invocation is, we cannot think it indispensable."‡

A. E. Burn.

## CONSIDERATIONS ON LIBERTY

The few remarks I propose to make in these pages do not profess to be a discussion of ultimate philosophical issues, but are concerned specially with the practical problem, What is the minimum assumption about freedom compatible with recognition of the Christian scheme of life? There have been times when the prime practical necessity for a Christian teacher has been to vindicate the reality of human agency against a theological fatalism which makes all men mere puppets in the hands of a capricious Deity, and others in which the chief moral

* *The Holy Communion*, p. 204.

† *Op. cit.*, p. 156, *n.* Waterland, *Doctrine of the Eucharist*, chap. v. (*Works*, vol. vii., p. 99 foll.). Oxford, 1823.

‡ *Op. cit.*, p. 145.

danger has come from a Pelagianism which makes the natural man his own saviour and completely evacuates the conception of "grace." But at the present neither absolute Predestinationism nor Pelagianism is a living enemy. What we have really to contend with is a half-thought-out "determinism" which denies the reality of moral accountability by teaching that each of us in all his conduct is what he has been made by the interplay of an "inherited" disposition and an environment of circumstance not made by himself, so that, in the last resort, every act of every one of us is strictly the outcome of "circumstances over which he has no control." Probably few of the men of science who call themselves "determinists" would be willing to take responsibility for the doctrine in the crude form in which it is proclaimed by the secularist lecturers and pamphleteers, and for practical purposes it is a secondary question whether the cruder doctrine really does follow from the premises of the scientific men or not. What I am concerned with is the popular secularist version of the doctrine and the equally crude popular misconceptions of the Christian view of liberty which commonly accompany it.

A. Misconceptions of the Christian View of Liberty.

(1) It is often assumed in popular controversy that it is part of the Christian doctrine to hold that any man can at any moment do right if only he wishes to do so, and that a man's natural temperament and past history make it neither easier nor more difficult for him to wish to do right at the present moment. Human liberty is, then, supposed to be disproved by the familiar considerations that what is easy to a man of equable temper or of cold disposition may be very hard to a man of natural quick temper or of an ardent sensual temperament, and what is easy to a man whose habits are still plastic may be intensely hard to one who has fallen under the domination of habit. In other words, it is forgotten that the liberty of which the New Testament speaks is always spoken of not as something which we all possess *ab initio*, but as a gift bestowed upon the Christian by his redemption, or a prize yet to be won. It is no part of the Christian view of life to hold that a mere formation of the wish to do right will of itself secure the defeat of evil habits which have grown in strength by years of indulgence, or that all kinds of right-doing are equally easy to all men.

(2) Nor need I add that the New Testament, at any rate, cannot be asserted to teach that the complete liberation from all possibility of wrong-doing (*non posse peccare*) is ever

attained by any Christian on this earth. The possibility that the man who seems to stand most firmly may fall, if he relaxes in his vigilance, is always left open. Even the familiar doctrine that this complete "establishment in good" is bestowed at death upon those who leave the world in a state of grace can hardly be said to be more than an inference, drawn by theologians from the express teaching of Scripture, which falls very far short of complete demonstration. But it is, at any rate, implied in the command to abstain from all sin that abstention is not impossible; that it can at least be said of the Christian that *potest non peccare?* The question is whether there is anything in our natural knowledge, whether physical or psychological, which is inconsistent with this implication. Could we ever say of any man in any contingency *non potest non peccare?* Is it true, as at least one distinguished writer on ethics in our own day has asserted, that for every man in virtue of his "inherited" temperament or disposition there are certain temptations to which he *cannot* avoid yielding, and that a sufficiently competent judge of human character can tell what, in the case of a given man, these temptations are? If this is true, there would clearly be an end of the Christian rule of life. It would be absurd to say "you must live chastely" to a being of whom I could also say with truth that "it is impossible this man should live chastely."

(3) I think it important to remember that the possibility for conflict between science and religion in respect of this issue is very much diminished when we remember that freedom is represented in the New Testament as a gift of grace which has been secured to us by the redemptive work of God, and is liable to be withdrawn if it is neglected or abused. Even if complete determinism were the unmistakable teaching of natural science, we should still have to remember that the operations of grace belong *ex hypothesi* to the supernatural order, with which none of the natural sciences so much as professes to concern itself. To argue that if psychology points to determinism, by showing that it is not in our own power by unaided effort to subdue certain temperamental defects or to break the bondage of long-established evil habits, the way of escape is absolutely closed, is simply to take it for granted that the familiar natural order is the only order there is, the very same assumption made in the old fallacious *a priori* objection to the miraculous. It ought to be clear that this denial of the existence of a supernatural order is not in any way required or supported by the sciences themselves. They tell us, or attempt to tell us, what the natural order is, but whether there is or is not also a supernatural order, and whether man is or

is not a member of both orders at once is a question upon which science is wholly and necessarily silent. If—*e.g.*, in prayer for divine help or, again, in the sacraments—we have a direct avenue to a source of power (God) lying wholly outside the realm of the natural, it would be perfectly conceivable that by prayer or through the sacraments we may escape bondage to the past by a way of which empirical psychology can take no account and ought to take no account. For, of course, the man who claims that he has found this road to freedom is not claiming that he has delivered himself by his own strength, and no psychologist's demonstration that the strength to achieve the deliverance is not in him could possibly touch his claim to have been delivered by a higher might.

There is, however, just one point where science might have a word to say in the matter. The man who derives strength from "on high" by an appeal to God must at least make the appeal or, at any rate, try to make it. The power to pray is itself a "grace"; we cannot of ourselves command the power of "effectual prayer," yet something at least we must do on our own side. None of us, I take it, will deny that the bestowal of grace is regularly consequent on the making of an effort of some kind on our part. And it might be said that, if the determinist doctrine is true, our own part irrevocably settles for us the question whether on a given occasion the effort shall be made whether we shall so much as "wish to pray." Hence we cannot avoid having to consider—

B. The Real Force of the Arguments for Determinism.

(1) The main point on which we need to be clear is this. The determinist says that we do, in fact, make choices between alternative courses of action, and the choice we make really does express our character, good or bad, as it is at the moment when the choice is made. But my character had been made what it then was by past acts of choice. In the last resort he thinks, then, of me as starting with a given "nature" of some kind which was not dependent for what it was on any choice of mine. What I am now has grown out of what I was, to begin with, in its interplay with the various things and persons who have made up my "environment" through life. When he goes on to deny "liberty" or "indetermination," what he wants to say is that this given endowment, expressing itself in reaction against the particular circumstances, could only have expressed itself in the way which has actually been taken. It follows that, apart from the possibility of contacts with a supernatural order resulting in an outflowing of super-

natural grace, I am absolutely a slave to my own past *on one condition*—viz., that the original "nature" which I brought into the world with me was itself something made once for all and fully determinate. If this condition is not fulfilled, then all that the determinist says about temperamental differences, the effects of education, the force of habit, may be perfectly true, and yet it will not follow that liberty and indetermination mean nothing, even apart from all considerations of a supernatural order. The thesis I think it practically important to maintain is just this, that our "original" or "congenital" nature or endowment itself is certainly never a completely made and determinate product; it is in itself fluid and indeterminate.

(2) No one could, of course, suppose that we come into the world with ready-made "habits," but in the popular literature there is a great deal of confused language about the good and bad qualities which we bring into the world with us. Now, in the first place, we cannot insist too strongly on the point that our original endowments are not themselves either good or bad. A hot temper or a "warm" complexion is neither a virtue nor a vice, but may be the material for either. The "hot temper," for example, may make a man a mere quarrelsome bad neighbour, but it is also a valuable, perhaps an indispensable, asset in the make-up of an earnest and indefatigable reformer of wrongs. The "warm complexion" may make it easier for a man to yield to sexual temptations, but it stands in the way of his yielding to others which more readily assail the naturally "cold" and calculating. Further, the known presence in a man of a temperamental bias may actually call out steady and determined resistance, and so be an actual condition of the man's attaining a level of heroism or sainthood he might not have reached without his "thorn in the flesh." The sweetness, humility, purity of a noble character are often directly due to steady internal warfare against a known temperamental bias to resentment, pride, or sensual indulgence. If any tendency could be pronounced in itself a "bad heredity," one might think it would be a constitutional craving for the excitement of strong drink; yet a man may be made a hero who otherwise would have been in danger of taking life easily, precisely because he knows the tendency is in him and has to be fought against.

Again, we must remember that when we come into the world we do not even bring "qualities" ready-made along with us. We talk of a congenital "hot temper," but we do not mean that babies are born angry or that they are always "in a temper." We only mean that as time goes on they will show

resentment on slighter provocation than babies of a more placable temperament—*unless* they receive a careful corrective training early enough. We cannot exaggerate the importance of remembering that all a man " inherits " in the way of mental and moral endowment is " inherited " in the form of mere tendency, and that tendencies are not determinate, but utterly fluid. So far from making man's character for him, his tendencies may lie dormant and unsuspected for years, or may never reveal themselves at all if the circumstances of his life do not provide the appropriate occasion for the revelation.

(3) It follows from the fluidity of tendency that we can set no theoretical limits to the extent to which original tendency may be checked or modified by discipline and reflection, and the discipline, of course, can and should be undertaken not merely by preceptors and parents in early life, but by the man himself as he gradually grows to years of intelligence. We have no right whatever to deny not only that an original tendency can be modified, but that it can be extirpated or reversed by the action of circumstances and *a fortiori* by unremitting self-discipline and resolution, and when we remember this, the sting of determinism is drawn. The doctrine then reduces to the commonplace that for each man there are moral graces of character which are harder to acquire than others, a proposition no moralist is called upon to deny. It is sheer confusion of tendency with formed character which prompts the absurd declaration that for a given man there are sins which he " cannot help " committing.

(4) The reference to deliberate self-discipline leads me to say a word about the " indetermination of the will." It has been fashionable to speak of this as an illusion, but I confess it appears to me a patent fact, when once one has cleared one's mind of the confusion between will and desire. It is a patent fact that we can and do often choose to do a thing simply because we judge that it is, in Henry Sidgwick's phrase, " the right and reasonable thing *per se* to be done," without any desire of the consequences to follow from doing it. To take a trivial example, if I am going to play a game of chess, I see that it is reasonable to decide without wasting time whether I shall take the white or the black pieces, and that the sensible thing is to settle the issue by " tossing." I may be quite indifferent whether I play white or black, or I may even have a partiality for white, and decide to leave the issue to the fall of the coin precisely in order to eliminate this partiality. The point this illustrates is exactly what St. Thomas calls " indetermination." His contention, you will remember, is that we may have strong conflicting desires, but that the " will "

remains indetermined to either until we have formed a judgment on the question which of the objects desired is good or is more good than the other. The language seems to me precisely appropriate. I strongly "want" A, but I do not choose to act on my "want" so long as I am uncertain whether or not the getting of A is good for me, and in the meantime my will or choice is not yet determined. When I do make up my mind, the determination depends directly not on a series of events in my past, but on my present judgment that the getting of A is good. I do not see what objection can be made to this doctrine of indetermination, unless it is alleged that in some way my supposed congenital endowments in the end decide the question whether I shall reflect at all, and, if so, whether I shall come to the conclusion that A is good or that it is not. And this allegation is, in the first place, seriously affected by what has already been said about the indefinite modifiability of tendencies. In the second place, there is no possible proof that, as William James has suggested, the making or withholding of an effort of attention may not be the one unconditioned and original contribution we have it in our power to make to the order of things. No one can possibly show that the history of my past life settles beforehand whether or not I shall make an effort of attention and reflection at the present moment. To assert that my past does foreclose this issue is, as it seems to me, a mere prejudice due to the inveterate habit of trying to apply to things which are all along fluid, and "in the making" modes of thought only applicable to the rigid and determinate objects of the mathematical sciences; it is to geometrize life and morals. If the determinist's psychology were a sufficient ground for denying the freedom of willing, it ought equally to be a ground for denying the freedom of thinking. He should be prepared to hold that when I dismiss a bad argument as transparently illogical, my conviction of its fallaciousness is, in fact, only a consequence of my having been accustomed to reject similar arguments in the past. If determinism affords no ground for holding that my acceptance of a demonstration—*e.g.*, the determinist's own demonstration of his thesis—is genuinely due to my present sound insight, equally it affords no ground for denying that my present choice is genuinely due to a correct present judgment of good. His further allegations about the way in which I have come by that judgment all seem to me, as I have said, to depend on gross misconceptions about the meaning of "tendency." He is, in fact, trying to do what no philosophy can do without falling into absurdities, to get rid of the whole conception of "potentiality" or "real possibility." The odd

thing is that he does not do this consistently. He may tell me that there are some sins into which my original endowment compels me to fall; he does not tell me that there are fallacies of reasoning which my original endowment forces me to commit. Yet any argument which would prove that I am *forced* to commit theft or fornication will equally prove that I am forced, by my temperament, to commit *ignoratio elenchi*, or "illicit process of the major."

(5) Let me end by summarizing my positions. As against the popular "determinism" of the secularist lecturers, we may say that it is simply false that our conduct is "due to circumstances over which we have no control," or that we are born with tendencies which we cannot counteract. In point of fact, we are ourselves daily making our own character by our acts and choices, and there is no real warrant for saying of any congenital tendency in a sane man that it cannot be counteracted if he will take the requisite trouble to counteract it. When we sin, it is from our own wilfulness or carelessness, not because we are made to sin by anything in our own past or the past of our parents. The "indetermination of the will" is a genuine fact, and there is no reason to doubt that we could liberate our will, as we can liberate our judgment, to an extent to which no theoretical bounds can be set, if we would consent to the regular practice of serious reflection. At the same time, it is well to reflect that our liberty, if real, is also limited in various ways. Just as it does not always extend to outer action, as no volition can set the broken or paralyzed limb at work, so we have no reason to think that mere wishing, without serious and effectual effort at reform, will of itself deliver us from an undesirable tendency or a bad habit, and it is no part of Christian doctrine to assert that we have. Nor does any rational theory of the nature of the "freedom of the will" give any encouragement to the loose Pelagian way of thinking which ignores the necessity of waiting on God, and the assistance of divine grace co-operating with our own genuine human effort for the achievement of "good works." To suppose that it depends on my will to be another St. Paul or another St. Francis would be as absurd as to suppose that by an exercise of will I could be a second Shakespeare or Mozart. But to say that God has not bestowed on me the graces needed to make a St. Paul does not entail the consequence that He has not put it in my power to lead a life free from sin and fruitful in good in my own vocation.

A. E. Taylor.

# A NORFOLK PARISH 400 YEARS AGO

THE parish of Shipdham in Norfolk possesses a volume of churchwardens' accounts for the years 1511–1567. Whilst this is not amongst the oldest of such MS. books, it deals with an all-important period of Church history, and a brief examination of it should yield some objects of general interest to those who enquire into the days that are past.

We must begin by saying that the story is not complete year by year, and yet there is sufficient material to illustrate the momentous changes which succeeded each other with startling rapidity. The colourless records say nothing of the passionate strife which must have perturbed the parish life, and are as neutral in the matter of doctrinal changes as the annual balance sheet of the Chancellor of the Exchequer is free from political controversy. It is necessary first of all for us to understand the position and powers of the churchwardens. They were four in number, and were elected annually by the "Town." The terms "village" and "parish" are not used. Only once, for what reason is not stated, the outgoing churchwardens nominate two of their successors, and the town elects the other two. The time when the Rector nominated any of the churchwardens had not yet come. Nor had he any part or lot in the disposal of the money administered by them. The Rectors, who are officially described as "M^r^ Parson," occasionally present gifts or leave legacies, but these are received and administered by the churchwardens. In the earlier years covered by the accounts the Rector was Thomas Alcock, brother to Dr. Alcock, Bishop of Ely, and founder of Jesus College, Cambridge, and the family crest is still engraved on a mantelpiece in the Rectory House. He was, in addition, Master of Jesus College and Archdeacon and Chancellor of Ely, so that probably he was much absent from the parish until his death in 1523, when his body was buried in the chancel of the church.

The Bishops of Ely appointed to the parish until 1561, when Queen Elizabeth made her first appointment of Rector. The parish was an agricultural one of large area, richly endowed because it had not been robbed in the interests of a monastery, and we can assume its church life to be typical of other country parishes in Norfolk in the sixteenth century.

The churchwardens, sometimes called "churchrevys," seem to have used an itinerant scribe to prepare their accounts, who was also sometimes employed in repairing and binding the church service books. "A^t^ y^e^ coming of y^e^ boke bind^r^,"

again, "whan a wrote heyr," and frequently "payde for wrytyng of thys cow̄te."

These scribes were not highly educated, though occasionally they prefaced their accounts with a few words of Latin—*e.g.*, "et sic remanet in manibus gardianorum, xxiii$^{s}$." and "receptore ad remanēt̄ra debit

"supioris anni, xiii$^{li}$ v$^{d}$."

Their spelling obeyed no rules. The same name is spelt in two or three different forms on the same page.

There is an annual charge of viii$^{d}$. for the expenses of the visitor, apparently some diocesan official, whether the Archdeacon or not does not appear, and the scribes make merry with his title thus:

Wysseter, Vysytar, Vesytur, Vesitur, Wysytur, Vesetur, and other forms.

In stating the amounts of money they use Roman numerals, and the term "obole" for ½d. Thus 8¾d. would be written viii$^{d}$. i$^{ob}$. i$^{q}$.

The comparative value of money then and now is a question of much difficulty, nor am I able to discover any agreement amongst writers on economics upon the proportions to be used. Unskilled labour was paid at the rate of 4d. a day, and the skilled labour of carpenters and masons received from 6d. to 7d. A man is paid 1d. for riding a distance of some ten miles on churchwardens' business. When we have occasion to estimate the present value of money, I propose to multiply the amounts paid and received by 12. The various estimates differ from 10 to 20. Our estimate will convert 1d. of their money into 1s. of ours.

## The Church.

The present church of Shipdham was comparatively new in 1511, and was built, to replace an older one, in the fifteenth century, that great period of Norfolk church-building. The sanctus bell remains in its turret to this day. The room over the porch, now used as a library for a valuable gift of a previous Rector, was often occupied by night by an assistant priest or the parish clerk or a caretaker as a precaution against theft, owing to the many valuables the church contained.* The bells, we shall see later, were in constant use, and were rung almost daily. The accounts every year contain many entries of expenses for them: new ropes, new gogyns (gudgeons), new baldricks, new clappers. The churchyard fence was of wood.

* This library contains many valuable books of history and theology, and possesses a Psalter which came from a Norfolk nunnery, and which equals in beauty and design the more famous Romsey Psalter.

This we learn from the frequent charges for timber and nails for repairs. The Church had a clock: "for makyg of an yerne (iron) for y^e^ cloke," "for kypping (keeping) of the clok." The organ is always described in the plural as "organs." The word is variously spelt; thus, "mendyn off y^e^ orgwnnys." The churchyard walks are called alleys or aisles: "for schulyng of y^e^ halys" (for shovelling the walks), "for makyng of y^e^ Cherche alyse." The font had a wooden cover, which was fastened with a lock: "for a locke for y^e^ funtte."

The constant ringing of bells was a feature of the Church life of the parish. In 1513 we read:

> "payde for fawte off rengyn qwhan y^e^ quenne cam thorow y^e^ contre, xii^d^."

(In default of ringing when the Queen came through the country.)

Henry VIII. required all church bells for many miles around to be rung when he or his Queen went on tour. Woe betide the churchwardens who neglected this mark of honour. One of the royal servants rode to the church and demanded a fine then and there. In case of refusal they locked the church and took away the keys, thus putting the churchwardens to the trouble and expense of sending the fine and recovering the keys. These servants would be the more zealous collectors because they would keep the money themselves. The churchwardens of Shipdham got out of their trouble by paying 12s. of present money.

Was Queen Catherine on a pilgrimage to the shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham, which at that time was at the height of its power? When Henry VIII. passed through Shipdham in 1523 it cost 3^d^ (3s.) to ring the bells—

> "payd for expēsys of Rēggars qwan the kyng came thoro the toune, iii^d^."

We know that Henry VIII. visited Walsingham in 1511, walking there barefooted for two and a half miles from East Barsham Hall.

## Sources of Income.

It will be understood that the churchwardens were the sole administrators of all the church and town funds, with the exception of the Rectory and its endowments, which belonged to the Rector.

We give abstracts from the accounts of two years; one an ordinary one, and the other a year of exceptional expenditure.

The usual sources of income were: (1) Rents from the many

pieces of land owned by them; (2) from "quethe wordes" (bequests); (3) Drynkkings or Church Ales; (4) "goderings in y^e^ Cherche"; (5) "fyns" (fines); (6) contributions from the parish guilds; (7) "Hallomes & Sollomes" offerings.

In 1517 the income amounted to vi^li^ iiij^s^ viii^d^ (nearly £75 of our money).

Let no one cast scorn upon the church ales of these distant days. They were the social gatherings of the parish, and correspond to our parish teas. The home-brewed ale was quite harmless, and the festivities concluded with music and dancing. Certain responsible parishioners acted as masters of the ceremonies, and either charged definite sums or made a collection. After expenses were paid the proceeds were given to the churchwardens, and a church ale was said to have been made by the promoters:

> "r^d^. off y^e^ drynkkyng y^t^ Thomas Howlyn & John Tenawnte made, xx^s^. (£12)."

### Expenditure.

In addition to the yearly expenditure upon washing church linen (no inconsiderable charge), mending the bells and organs, repairing the fabric, keeping the churchyard in order, cleaning the many candlesticks ("for skoring of y^e^ candylstyks"), there is the annual charge for setting up the Easter sepulchre and watching it from Good Friday to Easter Day. "Wechying off y^e^ sepulcur." "Setting up^e^ of the sepulcur."* Costly wax candles have to be provided. The church house which stood in the churchyard requires constant repairs. It was built of wood, and covered with thatch. The floors were spread with rushes. Here the church ales were held, and all the social life of the parish was centred. The receipts for the year almost always exceed the expenditure by a few shillings, which are duly handed over to the new churchwardens.

In 1525 the visitor is accompanied by the Den (Rural Dean). The cost of their visit to the parish is not great—The Wysytor viii^d^., the Den iii^d^.—but the result of the visit is seen in the balance sheet which follows.

They have ordered many repairs to be done to the "Stepull." A contract (bargynng) is made with Thomas Warde, "carpyndder," and the work begins. The two officials pay a second visit of inspection. Whence came the money for this restoration of the tower? The churchwardens of Shipdham publish their balance sheet of voluntary gifts. The guilds of the parish contribute handsomely, and individuals send subscriptions.

* In most cases the sepulchre was a temporary structure set up at Easter, though more permanent ones existed in some churches.

They raised money just as we raise it now, by appeals to our church people.

The receipts that year amounted to xix$^{li}$ xix$^{s}$. vii$^{d}$. (nearly £250).

### The Great Changes.

We have by no means exhausted the interest of the earlier accounts, but we turn now to our main purpose of showing what happened in this Norfolk parish in the tumultuous upheavals in the reigns of Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth.

### *The Reign of Edward VI.*

The accounts proceed with due regularity until the last year of Henry VIII., but after the first year of Edward VI. several leaves have been cut out, possibly by some churchwarden in the reign of Mary, who wished to destroy the records of the last few years. What remains tells us of the dismantling of the church in what Dr. Jessop has called the Great Pillage. For some reason or other the churchwardens spend large sums of money upon lead, presumably for repairing the roof.

"A booke of the artycles" is purchased for iiij$^{d}$. These would be the Ten Articles of Henry VIII.'s reign. Then follow these significant entries:

> "Expensys when we take doun y$^{e}$ images, x$^{d}$.
> For makyng y$^{e}$ bylle of y$^{e}$ sale of y$^{e}$ plate, iiij$^{d}$.
> For putting out y$^{e}$ imagys of y$^{e}$ alter clothys, ii$^{s}$.
> Rec: of Gregorie Whyte for the supulture tabnacles w$^{t}$ ther app$^{r}$-tences, xxx$^{s}$.
> Rec. for olde iren, iiij$^{s}$.
> For xl$^{l}$ of olde Laten (brass), v$^{s}$.
> For y$^{e}$ prynted clothys & curtaynes, xvi$^{s}$. ix$^{d}$.
> For old Laten, xx$^{s}$.
> Payd to y$^{e}$ clarke in ptye for whyting y$^{e}$ chyrche, xx$^{s}$.
> For small tabernacles & y$^{r}$ bordes, vii$^{s}$. iiij$^{d}$.
> Rec. for 119 ounces of silver & (a quantity undefined in weight), xlvi$^{li}$ xviii$^{s}$. x$^{d}$."

The last item would represent the sale of the church plate. I am afraid this sale of the plate was an illegal act of the churchwardens. The brass candlesticks and brasses from tombstones were sold as old brass. The loss of the next few pages prevents us from saying what became of the money from the sale of all the church furniture and valuable adjuncts of worship. History, however, records that such moneys were reserved for the King's use.

The church was stripped of all its adornments which had accumulated through many generations, and was made

clean with whitewash. This would not be the first whitewashing of the church, as the custom was introduced after the Black Death for sanitary reasons. This "whiting" was to obliterate the pictures in the frescoes.

### *The Reign of Mary.*

The accounts in the book are resumed with the reign of Queen Mary, though they are not complete for the five years. The painted windows having been destroyed, the Rector presents x$^{s}$. (£6) for glazing, the cross is mended, the sepulchre is remade, a manual provided, two candlesticks provided for the altar, a sanctus bell bought, and the holy water stoop restored to its place at the small cost of ii$^{d}$.

"Rec. of M$^{r}$ P̄son towards y$^{e}$ glasyng, x$^{s}$.
For mending y$^{e}$ crosse, iii$^{d}$.
Payde for makyng y$^{e}$ sepulcre, xi$^{d}$.
For a manuell, iii$^{s}$.
Payde for ii candylstycks for y$^{e}$ aulter, v$^{s}$.
For a masse booke, xx$^{d}$.
Payde for an antiphonen, iiij$^{s}$. iiij$^{d}$.
For y$^{e}$ blew aulter cloth & the pyx, viii$^{s}$.
For a payer of sencers, v$^{s}$. iiij$^{d}$.
Setting up the roode, iiij$^{d}$.
Nayles for the rode, xii$^{d}$.
Payde for laying & setting up y$^{e}$ holiwat$^{r}$ stop, xii$^{d}$.
Payde for making the aulter & paving the chirche flore whe the aulter stone lay, iii$^{s}$. iiii$^{d}$.
Payde for paynting of the canapie,* vii$^{s}$.
Payde for Mari & John (their images on the Rood), xx$^{s}$.
For making the sepuc$^{re}$ & for nayles & time & pinnīg in of the same xxxv$^{s}$. ii$^{d}$."

These and other small entries represent the attempt to restore the church to something of its former condition. On two occasions the Rector presents ten shillings, but there is an entry of xx$^{s}$. paid to him, which looks as if the churchwardens treated his gifts as loans.

### *The Reign of Elizabeth.*

With the death of Queen Mary came another change in the church life of Shipdham. Once more we have the cross sold for broken brass:

"For the brokyn lattyn of the crosse, xiiij$^{d}$."

The churchwardens pay vi$^{s}$. viii$^{d}$. "for a boke of dayly servys & another of ynioncyons."

* The canopy supported by four staves was carried in processions on Palm Sunday and other days.

These injunctions are mentioned elsewhere, and the new word proves a great stumbling-block to the local scribes.

By order of the Bishop an inventory of church goods has to be made—

> "Pay$^{d}$ for the makyng of the chyrch ynvetory, & for the making the same accordyle to the byshoppis clarke, xii$^{d}$."

Next we come to evidence of changes in the church:

> "Takyng doune the awter stones, xii$^{d}$.
> Pullyng doune the awlters & for makyng the pavement ageynther, xiii$^{s}$. iiij$^{d}$.
> For a boke of omyley, xvi$^{d}$.
> Mendying y$^{e}$ byble,* i$^{d}$. j$^{ob}$.
> Rec. for ii pecys of tymber wyche was of y$^{e}$ rode loffte, ii$^{s}$. vi$^{d}$.
> For the resydu—rode loffte, vi$^{s}$."

Once more money has to be spent upon the glazing of the church:

> "Payde to y$^{e}$ glaser for glasyng in y$^{e}$ churche & other places, v$^{s}$. ix$^{d}$."

By 1563 there is great improvement in management of the church lands, the rents from which have appeared irregularly. Thirty-three allotments are let at rents which bring each year vii$^{li}$ xii$^{s}$. ix$^{d}$., with an additional ii$^{s}$. vii$^{d}$. for copyhold rents. This would mean about £90 of our money.

In the same year they have to pay the Queen's subsidy:

> "Payd to y$^{e}$ quenes collector of y$^{e}$ subsydue, ii$^{s}$. vii$^{d}$."

An interesting entry shows the beginning in the parish of a regular record of marriages, christenings, and burials. These are complete to this day and begin in 1558. Not many parishes obeyed Richard Cromwell's order in 1538:

> "Payd to Thomas Skene for y$^{e}$ wryghtyng of yndentors between y$^{e}$ bysshop & y$^{e}$ toune as consernyng maryges crystenyngs & buryalls, †xii$^{d}$."
> Payd for a boke of prayer, viii$^{d}$.
> Payd for y$^{e}$ homyley boke, iiij$^{s}$."

Like injunctions, the word "homilies" is beyond the knowledge of the scribes:

> "For y$^{e}$ cōmunyon table, ix$^{s}$.
> For y$^{e}$ mending of y$^{e}$ cloth longyn to y$^{e}$ cōmunyon bord, ii$^{d}$."

The annual visitor still comes to the parish, and the Rural Dean pays his visitation. As we leave these accounts in 1567 we feel that a settled life has come to the parish, though so

* It had probably been neglected and injured in the reign of Mary.

† The parishes sent copies to the Bishop. The Diocesan Registries must contain large bundles of these, unless, as is probable, many have been destroyed.

different from what it was when we began with the accounts of 1511.

These extracts, full of interest though they may be, are only specimens of much to be learnt from churchwardens' accounts. A complete study of these might fill a volume, and shed much light upon past history.

In a few cases I have not been able to interpret the meaning of certain entries—*e.g.*, the payment each year towards the half-mark of 1d. We cannot but be struck with the constant generosity of the parishioners towards their church. Their surprises, indignations, and joyful triumphs, as one or other of the changes came, find no expression in these annual balance sheets, but we know all these things existed, and yet from one side or the other of religious views the church never lacked support.

"For ii$^{bs}$. of ots and a Henne."

Time after time this strange entry occurs almost without intermission.

In the light of information received from a Yorkshire parish, I venture upon an interpretation of it.

It refers, I think, to the annual "beating of the bounds" at Rogationtide, when young people especially were invited to go and learn the bounds of the parish. The perambulation was a day of fun and frolic. Some parishioners rode their own horses, and others lent horses to ride. When the procession returned to the church, I take the two bushels of oats to be for the horses which had been used. But what about the hen? Was it scrambled for at the close of the day by the children as an amusement for their elders as well as themselves?

A man still living gives this account of a "beating of the bounds" in a Yorkshire parish: "Then we all went into one field and the parish clerk into the other, when he threw the cock bird over the hedge, and we chased it until someone killed it, and was rewarded with the bird and a shilling. The date of the last perambulation was, I think, in 1866."

Another possible explanation is the purchase of a hen for the sport on Shrove Tuesday. The hen or cock was tethered on the green, and people paid an "obole" for each attempt to hit it. The cock money went like most other things to the church accounts. I find, however, no reference in the Shipdham accounts to the receipt of cock money.

HENRY LOWTHER CLARKE.

# THE ELECTION OF BISHOPS IN THE CHURCH IN WALES

According to the terms of the Welsh Church Act, 1914, the date of Disestablishment was to be determined by Order of Council, provided that the date so fixed should fall not less than six, and not more than twelve, months after the date of the passing of the Act. Without some interval between the two specified dates the work of the Church would have been obviously thrown into inextricable confusion. By Disestablishment the old machinery of Church Government was to be completely destroyed. The Welsh dioceses would cease to be represented in the Convocation of Canterbury. Church courts would cease to exercise jurisdiction. Obviously some new system must be in existence at the critical moment in order to replace the old. But the construction of machinery for the government of four dioceses was not a task that could be completed in a few hours. Hence even in the original Act provision was made for a preparatory period of a year, during which the Church was expected to reorganize herself, to determine her own constitution, and to set up the necessary bodies through which administrative and financial arrangements could properly be made.

The outbreak of the War led to an extension of the preparatory period far beyond the limits originally contemplated. Disestablishment did not become an accomplished fact until March 31, 1920. The long delay afforded the Church invaluable opportunities for careful thought and deliberation. It is, of course, true that the conditions under which the work of consultation was carried on were far from favourable. The vast preoccupations of the War filled all minds. A very large proportion of leading Churchmen were on active service. Amid the reverberations of the struggle it was not easy to concentrate attention on the investigation of ecclesiastical precedents, or the complexities of ecclesiastical law. However, in spite of all difficulties the work went steadily forward. Committees of lay and clerical members met repeatedly. Information was accumulated from various quarters. The advice of experts in Church History and Canon Law was sought and was generously given. Thus a provisional Constitution was framed for the "Governing Body of the Church in Wales," which was the somewhat clumsy title selected for the supreme council of the disestablished Church. This Constitution was laid before a Convention of the Church, assembled at Cardiff, in October,

1917, and with certain modifications and amendments was accepted. Elections followed, and the Governing Body having been brought into existence proceeded with the formulation of other parts of the Constitution of the Church. In this article it is proposed to deal only with one particular chapter—viz., that which lays down the rules for the election of Bishops. It is a subject which may be of some interest to the readers of THEOLOGY. For whether the Church of England is destined before long to suffer the same fate as the Church in Wales, or whether a form of modified Establishment can be discovered acceptable both to Church and State, it is scarcely conceivable that the present system of the appointment of Bishops should be allowed to continue permanently in force. That the Church of England should, in this fundamental matter, presently achieve a measure of self-government is the indispensable condition of progress. Whenever it becomes possible for her to select her own Bishops the method of selection to be adopted is sure to be determined in the light of precedents set, and experience acquired, in other branches of her communion. Among precedents the recent action of the Church in Wales will come under review.

In dealing with the problem the Church in Wales was, of course, fully minded to do nothing which could in any possible way transgress the principles of Episcopacy as they have been received in the Catholic Church from the earliest times. Now while the testimony of Church History is emphatic as to the necessity of episcopal succession, it is no less emphatic as to the multiplicity of the methods, which may be, and have been, adopted for the selection of the man to be consecrated to the episcopal office. There have been times when on the occurrence of a vacancy the neighbouring Bishops have met and chosen a successor in the presence of the assembled laity of the vacant see. There have been times when the people of the see have elected, and the election has been confirmed and the consecration carried out by the neighbouring Bishops. Mediæval Kings succeeded in concentrating in their own hands the right to appoint the Bishops of their realms. The Papacy has been even more successful than Monarchy in securing and retaining the privilege of selection. In some cases the right of selection is unfettered, in others it is restricted to selection from among a certain number of nominees. So bewilderingly various have been the methods adopted in different countries, and in different centuries, that it is obviously within the competence of any province to devise its own plan of selection, provided that sufficient safeguards be secured excluding those who in faith or character are unworthy.

In these democratic days the obvious solution would

seem to be that the Church-people of the diocese should themselves select their father in God. It is, in fact, the usual solution. The election may be by the clergy alone, with the assent of the laity, as in South Africa. Or the clergy and laity may vote separately by orders, as in Canada. It is often the practice to require a two-thirds majority in favour of some one name before the election becomes valid, and various provisions are made to meet the difficulty when the requisite majority is not forthcoming. In Ireland, for example, the House of Bishops in such a case decides between the two candidates for whom most votes have been cast.

Now there are plain and undeniable advantages in thus placing the power of selection in the hands of the diocese. The man called to discharge the high and onerous duties of the episcopal office is *ipso facto* the man whom the majority desire to rule over them, the man to whom they are ready to accord a willing and eager obedience. But it cannot be denied that every system of diocesan selection is open to criticism on certain counts. Almost inevitably a contested election involves the division of the diocese into two parties. It is only too likely that party spirit will run high, nor does it always follow that the troubled waters will subside immediately after the election. When dioceses have been rent into two factions, the ill-feeling engendered may hamper and compromise the work of the Church for years to come. Again, wherever this system of diocesan selection is adopted in one or other of its modifications it will usually happen that the choice will fall on one of the clergy already in the diocese. Clergy and laity are not likely to have intimate knowledge of men working outside their own boundaries, nor are they likely to feel such confidence in a comparative stranger, however highly recommended, as to place in his hands the destinies of the diocese. Now it may well be that no better man could possibly be chosen than one from the diocese. He will come to his task fully equipped with knowledge of problems and persons. But it would certainly be more satisfactory if the appointment were made in the light of full knowledge of the comparative qualifications of other men of merit working elsewhere. *Mutatis mutandis* the same objections seem to lie against the election of a Bishop by his flock as lie against the appointment of an incumbent by the parish. Undoubtedly the parishioners are the persons most intimately concerned in the appointment. Undoubtedly it is their interests which deserve primary consideration. Most certainly it is only right and proper that their voices should be heard and listened to with the most earnest attention. But it does not necessarily follow that even in their own interest they are the people best qualified to make the appointment

unaided with the advice and co-operation of others. Their field of choice is limited. They have not had the opportunity of knowing many clergy personally. They may easily pass over the ideal man for the post in favour of some one with whom they happen to be acquainted. Just so may it be in the matter of the appointment of a Bishop.

There are also other highly important considerations arising out of the essential character of Episcopacy which should not be passed over. A Bishop's duties are not confined to his own diocese. He is not merely the administrative overseer of his own limited district. He is an officer of the Church at large. In consultation with his comprovincials he must be a moulder of policy and a defender of the faith. The common life of the Province will prosper in proportion to the degree in which the Bishops are men qualified to meet these responsibilities. Since then there are these highly important extra-diocesan duties to be discharged, there is much to be said for a system of election which introduces among the electors others, besides members of the vacant diocese.

Influenced by considerations such as these the Church in Wales discussed and accepted in the year 1919 the chapter of her Constitution defining the method of episcopal election. An Electoral College is set up for the purpose. It is composed of the diocesan Bishops, and of three clerical and three lay representatives from every diocese, in the province, with the exception of the vacant diocese, which sends double that number. These representatives are always elected by the Diocesan Conferences at the first meeting of their triennial term of office. They are there ready to discharge their duty if occasion should arise during the three years for which they have been elected. There is no question of a contested election when the vacancy has occurred and when party spirit might conceivably be stirred up. By the election of supplemental representatives provision is made for the filling up of vacancies in the Electoral College, due to death or resignation.

When a see falls vacant the Electoral College is summoned by the Archbishop. The summons must be issued within thirty days of the occurrence of the vacancy. The place of the meeting is the Chapter House of the Cathedral of the vacant see. After a celebration of the Holy Communion by the Archbishop the College proceeds to its duties. The first stage —viz., the nomination of one or more persons—is carried out in the Chapter House. Here an opportunity is given for brief speeches, in which explanations can be given, the requirements of the diocese described, the qualifications of the nominees compared. After the nomination the College returns to the

Cathedral. As each member's name is called he advances, and after a moment's prayer upon his knees places his voting paper in the urn provided for the purpose. The voting is by ballot, and there is no vote by orders. In order that the election may be valid it is required that the person elected shall receive not less than two-thirds of the votes of those present and voting. If the requisite majority is not forthcoming at the first ballot, the whole procedure is repeated. The College returns to the Chapter House, and new nominations are made. If after three days from the meeting of the College no person shall have received a sufficient number of votes, the right of appointment passes to the Archbishop of Canterbury. In this way the possibility of a deadlock is excluded.

The meetings of the Electoral College are strictly private. Only the final result of the election should be made public. The Electoral College after earnest and prayerful deliberation designates a certain person for consecration. Whether the person designated has or has not been unanimously elected, need not, and indeed should not, be disclosed. The act of election is the corporate act of the body specifically appointed for the purpose. In the interest of the position which the new Bishop will be called upon to fill the pledge of secrecy should be scrupulously honoured. He should enter upon his office backed by the whole weight of official selection by the Church. Nothing is gained by revelations to the Press about other names put forward and the comparative number of votes cast.

After election by the College, if the Bishop elect accepts the appointment, his name is submitted by the Archbishop to each member of the Bench of Bishops. Assembled in Synod they confirm his election, provided there be no canonical objection to his consecration and provided they be satisfied of his fitness.

Such is the system which is now undergoing the test of practical experiment in the Church in Wales. Happily since the date of Disestablishment no vacancy has occurred in any of the four historic sees of the Principality. Nevertheless the Electoral College has met twice. Although only four years have passed since Disestablishment two new sees have already been created. The teeming thousands of the South Wales coalfield rendered a division of the diocese of Llandaff an imperative necessity. The vast area of the diocese of St. David's, with which even modern facilities of locomotion could not cope, made division there also no less emphatically urgent. That the choice of the Electoral College in both cases will be abundantly justified by the development and rapid progress of Church life in the two new dioceses is the confident expectation of Churchmen in Wales.

G. C. Joyce.

# MISCELLANEA

## CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Norman E. Burton, who has been a member of the Auckland Diocesan Synod and Standing Committee and of the General Synod of the Church of the Province of New Zealand, writes as follows with regard to betting legislation: I was born in New Zealand and have lived in New Zealand all my life, and am now visiting England for the first time. I have given some thought to the matter both as a journalist and as a Churchman. It is impossible to suppress racing or betting. But racing and betting cannot be allowed to run wild. They must be regulated, so Parliament has decided to legalize the totalizator and suppress the bookmaker. There is much to be said in favour of this policy. The totalizator does not tout for customers; it provides an absolutely fair way of betting; it works in daylight; it tends to confine betting to those actually present at the race meeting, as the use of the telegraph for betting purposes is prohibited. The bookmaker is a social parasite. He has his touts in every shop and office and factory. They are a continual temptation. They are at work all day and every day, and provide inducements and opportunities for betting on every race at every race meeting in every part of the country. The curtailment of the gambling evil in New Zealand is greatly to be desired, and the best and most practicable way of curtailing it is the suppression of the bookmaker. This is the policy of the New Zealand Government, and it has the support of the Racing Clubs and the great majority of thoughtful citizens. Human nature being what it is, the betting instinct cannot be exterminated, and those people who clamour for the abolition of the totalizator should be prepared to suggest some less objectionable form of betting. The abolition of the totalizator would not suppress betting. It would drive it into foul channels.

---

## NOTE

### THE GENEALOGIES OF JOSEPH AND THE VIRGIN BIRTH

The question whether the Virgin Birth is a historical fact has been discussed so often and so fully that it would be superfluous to repeat the arguments here. This article is concerned with a single point in which a difficulty has sometimes been felt. If our Lord had no earthly father, and St. Matthew and St. Luke* knew it, why did each of them include a Genealogy of Joseph ?

There can be no doubt that it is his Genealogy that is given in both cases. The suggestion of Annius of Viterbo (*c.* A.D. 1490) that the Genealogy in the Third Gospel is that of the Lord's mother involves improbabilities so great that it is unnecessary to discuss them. And if it were true the difficulty in the First Gospel would remain. Lord Harvey's explanation (Smith's *D. B.*, ed. 2, art. " Genealogy of Jesus Christ ") is by far the most likely, that St. Matthew's list represents the throne succession, St. Luke's the natural descent. If that is accepted, their interrelation does not further concern us here, and they can be examined separately.

*St. Matthew :* It need hardly be said that there is no manuscript

* The names are used without prejudice. St. Matthew probably was *not*, and St. Luke probably *was*, the author of the Gospel which goes by his name.

evidence that this Gospel ever existed without the Genealogy, or that the passage relating the Virgin Birth was interpolated at a later date. No serious student imagines that interpolation will account for the present text of i. 18-25. All the eight verses, from the first word to the last, are a connected and straightforward narrative of the Virgin Birth as such. Whether the Genealogy and the Birth narrative were ever current in the form of separate documents which were incorporated by the evangelist is another matter, on which opinions differ. The fact which concerns us, and which causes difficulty, is that his Gospel includes both. But since it is inconceivable that he deliberately prefixed a Genealogy which stultified his narrative, he must have understood the former in such a way that it was for him compatible with the latter. And i. 16 is his connecting link between the two: "And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, from whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ."*

He relates that Mary was "espoused" to Joseph before the Conception, but that she conceived "before they came together," and the angel said to him, "Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy *wife*." The writer may be allowed to transcribe part of his note on i. 18: "The Jewish laws of marriage, though in many respects analogous to the Roman, differed widely from them as regards betrothal. Later Roman law knew of betrothal much in the English sense of the word. But in Jewish law not only an actual betrothal (*Kiddūshīm* or *Ērūsīm*), but the mere possibility that one party believed himself or herself to be betrothed to the other constituted an affinity which prevented the marriage of their relatives within the forbidden degrees (*Kidd.* iii. 10 f.); and a betrothed girl was a widow if her *fiancé* died (*Kethub.* i. 2), and this whether the man had 'taken' her to his house or not. After betrothal, therefore, but before marriage, the man was legally 'husband' (*cf.* Gen. xxix. 21; Deut. xxii. 23 f.); hence an informal cancelling of betrothal was impossible: the man must give to the woman a writ (*gêt*), and pay a fine." If, then, before conception they were legally husband and wife, the child was *legally Joseph's son.*

St. Matthew, who writes his Gospel as an *apologia* against Jews, wishes to press the fact that Jesus was the Messiah. But the Messiah must be a descendant of David. So he shows that He was the legal son of Joseph whom the Genealogy declared to be in the royal succession. Legitimacy of sonship, and therefore legality of succession, in spite of the Virgin Birth is what he proves by the Genealogy, and, conversely, that the Christian Messiah was not only the legal descendant of David but also the Son of God is what he proves by the narrative.

*St. Luke:* The difficulty here at first sight seems greater. There are only two verses in the story which explicitly relate the Virgin Birth—i. 34, 35: "And Mary said to the angel, How shall this be, since I know not a man? And the angel answering said to her, [The] Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; wherefore also that which is being born shall be called holy, Son of God." Many writers have held that these verses are a later interpolation. There is, of course, no manuscript trace of this; but it is thought that the rest of the narrative contains no statement which implies that Joseph was not the Lord's father, apart from the parenthetical "as was supposed" at the beginning of the Genealogy (iii. 23), which is also held to be an inter-

* Some variants are discussed in the present writer's *St. Matthew*, p. 4.

polation. But, as has frequently been pointed out, there is more than that to be considered. Is it likely that great stress would have been laid on the miraculous character of the birth of John the Baptist if He that was greater than John was born of a young married woman in the ordinary course of nature? And what else than a miraculous conception of Jesus is implied in i. 36, 37: "And behold Elisabeth thy kinswoman *she also* hath conceived in her old age, and this is the sixth month with her that was called barren: because nothing shall be impossible with God"? And if the angel announced only that a son should be born of her marriage who would be the Davidic King, what is the point of the sublime self-surrender in the reply (v. 38): "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word"? and of Elisabeth's congratulation (v. 45): "Blessed is she that *believed*," etc.? Moreover, a growing number of writers hold it probable that chapters i., ii. are a translation of a Hebrew original; and the fact that the words of the angel in vv. 34, 35, as also the canticles *Magnificat*, *Benedictus*, and *Nunc Dimittis*, can be easily rendered into Hebrew poetry, makes it, from a linguistic point of view, very unlikely that the two verses were a later addition to St. Luke's Greek.

But the more clearly it is shown that St. Luke related the Virgin Birth, the more insistent becomes the question why he gave the natural descent of Joseph. As in the case of St. Matthew the explanation is to be found in the purpose for which St. Luke wrote his Gospel. When he wrote it, and the Acts, Christianity had expanded out of Judaism and embraced Gentiles. And he wanted to make it clear to Theophilus and the Church generally that this was in accordance with God's plan. A universal Christianity was Judaism as God intended it to be, the Jewish Messiah was a universal Saviour. The Gospel illustrates the spirit of universalism revealed in the life and teaching of Jesus, in what "He began both to do and to teach"; the Acts relate how the universalism became a fact in the spread of Christianity from Jerusalem as far as Rome the capital of the empire, by all that Jesus continued to do and to teach by His Spirit in the Church. What kind of a Messiah was necessary for the working out of this divine plan? It must be one who was a Jew and a descendant of David, but who was at the same time far more. That He was a Jew and a descendant of David is shown by the Genealogy. Mary was "espoused" to Joseph (i. 27, ii. 5) and therefore legally his wife. No one would think of constructing a table of a woman's descent; but Joseph was a descendant of David, and therefore, by Jewish law, Jesus was the same. The "far more" is shown firstly in the narrative of the Virgin Birth. A descendant of David in law, He was "Son of God" (i. 35) in fact, and therefore could not only be set on the throne of His "father David" (i. 32), but could be "a Light to lighten the Gentiles" as well as "the Glory of God's people Israel" (ii. 32). Secondly, as Son of God He was akin not only to Jews but to all mankind, because Adam, the father of the whole human race, received his being from God (iii. 38).

Thus both evangelists wanted to proclaim that the Son of God, conceived by the supernatural operation of the divine Spirit, was the Messiah. To the masses in Palestine a Messiah who was not legally and rightfully an heir to the throne of David was unthinkable. And the only possible way of claiming this for Jesus was to show that He was legally the son of a man whose descent could be traced straight to David.

A. H. McNeile.

# REVIEW

THE SUMMA CONTRA GENTILES OF SAINT THOMAS AQUINAS. Literally translated by the English Dominican Fathers from the latest Leonine edition. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 2 vols. 12s. each.

A really adequate review of this important book would require special preliminary work of several weeks' duration. The reviewer would need to compare the translation—not only in selected passages, but line by line—with the original Latin, and at doubtful points the text with its source. But the writer who had gone through the required amount of work and travelling would then feel entitled to write a longer review than the Editor of THEOLOGY would wish to print.

There is, however, a humbler and less arduous task which is quite useful in its way. The readers of a review wish to learn from it whether they themselves would, in the considered opinion of the reviewer, be wise to incur the expense of buying the book reviewed and to undergo the labour of reading it. In the present case I can only say that we all, Catholics and Protestants alike, owe a debt of gratitude to the English Dominicans for following up their translation of the *Summa Theologica* by this translation of the *Summa contra Gentiles*. Medieval Latin, as St. Thomas writes it, ranks high among the instruments by which human thought can be expressed. But experience shows that there is a large number of men—some of them quite good scholars—who find it a far greater effort to read Latin than to read English, and that there are some who can recall and quote what they have read in English much more successfully than they can remember what they have read in any other language. Thus it is not only the unlearned reader who may find that St. Thomas comes nearer to him when he is made to speak in English.

As I have followed through the arguments of this book—of which even the most familiar has a curious appearance of novelty and freshness in its English dress—certain classes of Anglican readers have presented themselves to my mind as likely to benefit in an exceptional degree by a perusal of these two well-printed volumes.

There are, first, those who believe in the religious virtue of theology, but not in the religious value of philosophy: who would shelter themselves under Dr. Illingworth's epigram that "dogma is condensed history."* The upholders of this

* *Reason and Revelation*, p. 132.

view may be inclined, at first, to quote St. Thomas, and his well-known distinction between reason and revelation, in their own support. *Necessarium fuit præter philosophicas disciplinas, quæ per rationem investigantur, sacram doctrinam per revelationem haberi* (*Summa Theol.*, Part I., Q. i., A. 1). But we ought to notice that the issue, as it presented itself to the mind of St. Thomas, is not really quite the same as that which we have in mind in most of our discussions about "reason" and "revelation" in modern times. The "rational investigations" of which he is chiefly thinking are those intricate arguments of which the *Summa contra Gentiles* offers us so many examples. "It was necessary," he holds (*Summa Theol.*, I., i., 1, concl.), "that we should be taught by divine revelation even in respect of those things concerning God which *can* be investigated by human reason," *quia veritas de Deo per rationem investigata, paucis, et per longum tempus et cum admistione multorum errorum hominibus proveniret; a cujus tamen veritatis cognitione dependet tota hominis salus, quæ in Deo est.* This theme is developed more fully in the *Summa contra Gentiles* (bk. i., chap. iv.). It might be argued, says St. Thomas, that "it was useless to make" that truth which can be "attained by *reason*" an "object of *faith* by supernatural inspiration." He replies by pointing out the disadvantages that would result "if this truth were left solely to the inquiry of reason": and mentions those who are "naturally indisposed to knowledge," those who are "unable to devote so much to the leisure of contemplative research as to reach the summit of human inquiry—namely, the knowledge of God"; and, thirdly, those who are too indolent to study "metaphysics." St. Thomas, then, is thinking here of philosophical study. The modern opponent of authoritative revelation is thinking usually not of the philosopher, but of the simple believer who, as an individualistic Protestant, refuses to acknowledge the authority of the Church, and in modern times often adds to his Protestantism a liberal attitude towards the Bible. This type of simple believer has learned the lesson which has its philosophical and theological expression in Kant and Ritschl. He knows God through God's call—through duty. He "wills to do God's will, and so knows of the doctrine." He *knows* that he *ought* to obey Christ's law, and (so long as he maintains the penitent and humble attitude) *finds* that he *can*. This conviction and this general frame of mind the modern opponent of authority maintains to be *rational;* and it is of reason as recognizing and choosing duty, not of reason as framing metaphysical arguments, that he is chiefly thinking when he stands forth as a partisan of "reason" against

" revelation." St. Thomas, of course, knew well the religious capacities of the simple. *In simplicibus et mulieribus devotio abundat* (*Summa Theol.*, *Secunda secundæ*, cxxxii., 3). Still, his view of the relations of the speculative and the practical (*Sacra doctrina magis est speculativa quam practica quia principalius agit de rebus divinis quam de actibus humanis. Summa Theol.*, I., i., 4)—though well worthy of respectful study—is hardly one which the modern theologian can rightly be asked to accept. Kant and Ritschl, whatever their defects, have taught us something true and important; or, rather, Protestant experience has taught it, and they—perhaps imperfectly—have formulated the lesson. Again, when St. Thomas raises the question whether the created intellect can know the divine essence by its own natural powers, and speaks of the need of grace (*Summa Theol.*, I., xii., 4), he sets us a similar problem in the correct statement of religious truths. We need a statement which shall lead to humility and yet avoid obscurantism: which shall make clear that we know God by *His* grace and not by *our* merits, and yet shall not suggest that we can know Him otherwise than by *thinking*. Language which avoids the one error is apt to suggest the other. Thus, St. Thomas presents us with problems which nothing but a thoroughgoing Philosophy of Religion can solve; and he does this not only by what he explicitly says. Let any religious man seriously reflect on the questions with which the *Summa contra Gentiles* deals, and he will see—even if at first sight they seem to him to have rather forbidding titles (" Is God in any genus ?" " Is God His own essence, quiddity, or nature ?" " Is anything predicated univocally of God and other things ?")—that some of them, at least, have a definite bearing upon important religious issues. Can philosophic thought carry us as far in these matters as St. Thomas thinks ? But, if not, can theology, apart from philosophy, settle these questions for us even when their settlement is an obvious religious need ? Neither Kant, nor Hegel, nor any of their successors, has said the last word on these subjects. But still less has St. Thomas said the last word. Any man of good average education who knows from within what religion is will, I believe, rise from a careful and open-minded perusal of the *Summa contra Gentiles* with the conviction (1) that St. Thomas was a perfectly serious thinker, honestly wrestling with real problems, not (as superficial critics have sometimes said) a sophist disguising under technical language the vacuity of his thought; (2) that the instinct which makes every normal modern reader suspicious of his method is in some measure a sound instinct; (3) that St. Thomas has raised, but not always satisfactorily answered,

questions which are obviously philosophic and obviously important to religion; (4) that, even though much genuine progress has been made since his day, some of these questions have not been satisfactorily answered yet. I cannot conceive of any reader, of the class I have described, who (if he would allow any competent student of the *Summa contra Gentiles* to cross-question him fully on the problems which it raises) would end by saying, either that they were *none* of them of any importance to religion, or that for *all* of them he, or his teachers, had found the satisfactory solution. If this is a correct judgment, then the *Summa contra Gentiles* is good reading for those who are tempted to believe in the possibility of a non-philosophic theology.

But, secondly, there are those who believe in religion, but are distrustful both of theology and of philosophy. There are some persons of this class to whom it would probably not be wise to recommend even a glance at the *Summa contra Gentiles*. Some people are incapable of intellectual open-mindedness, or, at least, of a fair judgment of conflicting tendencies of thought; and if, to the end, one is going to conceive the world under very narrow categories, they may just as well be the categories of one's own decade as those of a remote century. If a man of this type has an interest, uncritical but genuine, in (say) the "new psychology," it is not always wise to try to discountenance such interests and substitute other studies. In a pursuit which is popular at the moment, he is sure of the stimulus of human fellowship. Yet we ought none of us to give up ourselves too readily as intellectually lost—as condemned by temperament to a lifelong one-sidedness. There is a large number of men and women who might learn from a perusal of these volumes that medieval theology has some very strong points. The theological questions of the "working man" are often quite in the medieval spirit; and even those who laugh at the working man's questions as old-fashioned can sometimes be shown, if a competent person will give himself the trouble to show them, that such questions do necessarily arise out of a religious life which means to take itself seriously and to give a consistent account of itself.

This brings us to a third class of Anglican readers who might profit by these volumes—namely, those many Anglican clergymen who, though they do not themselves belong to either of the two classes already described, have in their parishes representatives of both. I venture to suggest to those who are going to open subjects for discussion at clerical meetings

that it might be seriously worth their while to take one or more of the questions of which the *Summa contra Gentiles* treats, and to ask their brethren to reflect upon them and upon the reasoning by which St. Thomas establishes his conclusion. St. Thomas —it has been said—has a wonderfully correct insight into the religious bearing of theological phrases. I should like to hear this thesis defended by a sufficient array of examples. But certainly the religious significance of some of his conclusions is obvious.

Take—as specially suitable for the kind of discussion I have in mind—the thesis that the divine essence surpasses "every form to which our intellect reaches" (bk. i., chap. xiv.), that, therefore, we cannot grasp what God *is*, but only what He is *not* (chap. xxx., end). It is a saying of Hegel's that "all that God is He reveals." Dante, on the other hand, in canto xix. of the *Paradiso*, says that God could not so impress His worth upon the world that there should not remain over "an infinite excess." The latter view seems at first sight the more reverent. But let us think it out. This canto, read either in the Italian or in a good prose translation, will show quite plainly what was the religious significance of this doctrine for Dante. It was intended to reconcile him to dogmas about God's treatment of man which had seemed to him to represent God as unjust. We shall most of us agree here with Dante's first thought rather than with his second; and many of those who, when confronted with this opposition between Hegel and Dante, will at first be inclined to say that we cannot possibly know which is right, and that the question is of no religious importance, may see cause to alter their opinion. Whether in speaking of the justice of God we are using the word "justice" in the same sense as when we speak of it in reference to human behaviour, is at least no trivial question. Similarly in many other cases these medieval doctrines will be seen, on reflection, to have a practical and religious bearing. The canto referred to presents its problem in a sufficiently vivid form to be the starting-point of a very interesting discussion.

In writing the *Summa contra Gentiles* St. Thomas had specially in view those who did not accept the authority either of the New Testament or of the Old. It is probable that few readers of THEOLOGY, if any, accept the authority of Scripture quite in his sense of the words. It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that, in the Church of England, "we are all Gentiles now." There are, therefore, many others, besides those who fall into the special classes I have tried to define, who would be well advised to acquaint themselves, or to

improve their acquaintance, with the work of St. Thomas, when he "has recourse to natural reason to which all are compelled to assent."

The editors, in their Preface, speak of the difficulty of reading the "hand-writing" of St. Thomas. I know that it is commonly said that the *Summa contra Gentiles* exists in an autograph copy, and that this statement is repeated by respectable authorities. In view of the difficulty of establishing historical facts of this character, one would like to know what exactly is the evidence on which this most interesting statement rests. I remember a picturesque story, told in the Preface to the Leonine edition of 1888, of the fortunes of the MS.; but I do not recall that the evidence that it was St. Thomas's own copy was clearly or critically set forth. I think that it would have been an improvement to the present translation if the editors had told us just what amount of proof exists. Is it certain, again, that "becomes," or "is becoming," is the best English translation for *competit* with a dative—*e.g.*, in translating *non igitur Deo competit habitualis cognitio* (i., 56); *cum infiniti ratio quantitati competit* (69); *intellectui nostro competit cognoscere privationem* (71)? If the translators had adopted the method of translating the same Latin word by the same English word with absolute uniformity, "becoming" might have been the best word to choose. But in i., 88, for *Deo liberum arbitrium competit*, they say, "Free will is *befitting* God." This quasi-technical use of the word "becomes" might well confuse the English reader when he comes in i., 53, to the phrase, "whereby it becomes intellect in act" for *per quam fit intellectus in actu*. But these are small blemishes in an admirable piece of work.

CHARLES J. SHEBBEARE.

## NOTICES

PRINCIPLES OF NATURAL THEOLOGY. By George H. Joyce, S.J. Longmans. 8s. 6d.

This new volume of the Stonyhurst Philosophical Series is a notable one, fully deserving its asterisk of commendation in the February leaflet of the C.S.S.S. It covers nearly the same ground as Fr. Boedder's well-known *Natural Theology*, but the treatment is fuller and less technical, and the criticism of competing philosophical systems much more adequate. Anglican readers will be interested to observe that, though both writers are Jesuits, and accept the same general philosophical standpoint (both as Neo-scholastics), their views upon several theological questions of importance diverge considerably. Fr. Joyce shows himself as keen a critic of other schools of thought within his own communion as of the mistaken views (as he regards them) of "those without."

The main object of his book is to offer strict logical and demonstrative proof of the existence and chief attributes of God. As he correctly points out, there has been a widespread tendency, since the age of Kant, to acquiesce in that philosopher's judgment, that the traditional proofs of God's existence and attributes are invalid, and in consequence to base religious faith, not so much upon logical demonstrations, as upon "experience" and the spiritual needs and aspirations of the human soul. This modern tendency is sharply challenged by Fr. Joyce. "We contend," he writes, "that the method of direct reasoning is open to us, and that no just exception can be taken to a very large body of [theological] conclusions already reached. . . . Our organon of proof is Aristotelian logic, the ultimate test of each step being the principle of contradiction."

Fr. Joyce's whole case, therefore, rests upon the assumption that the leading principles of Aristotelian logic are absolutely and unconditionally valid—valid not only within the limits of human thought and experience (as Kant admitted), but *universally*, so that all things human and divine —"noumena," or "things-in-themselves," as well as "phenomena," or "appearances"—come within its scope, with the result their existence and nature are capable (in principle, at least) of strict logical demonstration.

It must be conceded to Fr. Joyce that he has on his side (1) practically the whole philosophic tradition anterior to Kant; (2) the plain man, who reasons instinctively according to the principles of common sense (*i.e.*, Aristotelian logic), and regards the questioning of these principles as mere sophistry; (3) very many, perhaps the majority, of modern logicians; (4) the actual practice of not a few alogistic philosophers (Bergson, for instance), who, while in theory denying the validity of logical and intellectual arguments, yet show themselves keen intellectualists, for they argue resourcefully and elaborately (using all the resources of the traditional logical methods) in defence of their philosophic and religious views.

On the other hand, we are bound to give due weight to the fact that the *absolute* validity of the Aristotelian logic is now confidently challenged from at least three quarters. (1) The Kantians and Neo-Kantians very generally maintain that, though its principles are valid within the sphere of "phenomena" (*i.e.*, things as presented to and apprehended by the mind), they are by no means applicable to "noumena" or "things-in-themselves" (*i.e.*, things as they subsist in their own natures, independently of the mind's knowledge of them). (2) The Hegelians and Neo-Helegians, while not entirely rejecting the law of contradiction, which is the basic principle of the ordinary logic, yet object to the manner in which Aristotelian logicians apply it. Moreover, they contend that the logic of Aristotle possesses only a relative and provisional value, requiring to be corrected and supplemented by the more adequate logic of Hegel, which alone is a trustworthy guide in the investigation of ultimate reality. (3) The Pragmatists, Bergsonians, and other schools of "Irrationalists" or "Alogists," who dethrone reason altogether from its ancient seat of supremacy, deny or doubt the possibility of attaining truth by intellectual means, and tend to identify truth with mere utility.

Dr. Joyce's argument against the Kantian depreciation of logic is well urged, and (in the present writer's opinion) fairly satisfactory. He might, perhaps, have strengthened his position by using the *ad hominem*

argument, that all Kantians do, as a matter of fact, admit that it is possible, by the use of logic, to infer validly the existence of other human minds. Knowledge of other human minds cannot fairly be called "phenomenal" knowledge. It is knowledge of other minds, not as they "appear" to us, but as they exist objectively in their own natures, feeling, thinking, desiring, willing, imagining, and reasoning, just as we do. If, therefore, it is possible, by the use of Aristotelian logic, to infer validly, from the data of experience, the "objective" (and not merely the "phenomenal") existence of other finite minds, there seems to be no reason based on principle, why a similar argument for the objective existence of a supreme mind should not be regarded as valid.

To discuss the Hegelian objections to the Aristotelian logic is impossible in a short notice like this. It must suffice here to remark that they are far less fundamental than the Kantian. Hegel regarded Kant's famous criticism of the theistic proofs as sophistical; and maintained that, if not by the Aristotelian, at any rate by *his own* logic, the existence and attributes of God can be intellectually demonstrated.

With regard to Pragmatism and the allied alogical systems, they are obviously declining in influence, and probably not a single British philosopher would now defend such a system of pragmatical logic as was sketched by Mr. F. C. S. Schiller in his *Formal Logic* (1912).

Aristotelian logic has not as yet won back its old position of unquestioned supremacy, which Fr. Joyce desires to vindicate for it, but it is doing more than hold its own. Neither the strict Hegelian logic, nor the modifications of it proposed by Mr. Bradley, Mr. McTaggart, and Dr. Bosanquet, seem to be winning adherents. Professor Cook Wilson's influential lectures on logic are in many ways original, but they are decidedly Aristotelian in spirit, and Mr. H. W. B. Joseph's *Introduction to Logic*, the textbook in general use at Oxford, represents (in spite of certain modifications and improvements in detail) a conscious return to the genuine Aristotelian tradition. The movement "Back to Aristotle" is by no means purely Roman and scholastic, and if it finally triumphs, there seems to be no reason why the next generation of writers on Natural Theology should not once more begin to speak of "proofs" and "demonstrations" of God's existence and attributes.

CHARLES HARRIS.

---

ARISTOTLE. By W. D. Ross. Methuen and Co., Ltd. 1923. Pp. vi+300. 12s.

To review this book at length is hardly necessary. For the most part, it is an epitome of facts which are not in dispute. It forms a most useful compendium of the entire Aristotelian system, including (what is hardly to be met with elsewhere) an adequate account of the biological and physical doctrine of the great philosopher and scientist. To the beginner the work will be most valuable, as giving a lucid and not too diffuse preliminary view of a difficult subject of vast dimensions. Even the advanced student will profit by the excellent analyses of the less read treatises.

The ordinary student of Aristotle knows only *The Metaphysics*, the *De Anima*, the *Nicomachean Ethics*, the *Politics*, the *Constitution of Athens*, and (if a specialist in logic) the logical treatises. By studying these illuminating pages, which are full of curious and out-of-the-way informa-

tion, he will be able to fill in the many gaps in his knowledge, and to form a more adequate idea of the comprehensive genius of the Master, who, great as he was as a philosopher, was probably greater still as a scientist, particularly as a biologist.

The student of the New Testament will turn with interest to Mr. Ross's account of recent critical work upon the disputed treatises of the Aristotelian canon. Most of the books which were disputed or rejected a generation ago (*e.g.*, *The Endemian Ethics*, *The Categories*, *The De Interpretatione*) are now accepted as genuine. The conservative trend of recent criticism upon the two great philosophic canons of antiquity, the Aristotelian and the Platonic, is not without its significance for the criticism of the New Testament canon.

CHARLES HARRIS.

---

S. AVGVSTINI EPISTULÆ. Ex recensione Al. Goldbacher, Pars. V. (=*Corpus Scriptorum Eccl. Lat.*, vol. lviii.). Vienna and Leipzig. 1923.

The appearance at last of this volume of prolegomena and indices to the Letters of St. Augustine will be cordially welcomed by all students of the great Father; it makes the four bulky volumes of the Vienna text manageable and usable. In bulk the present volume was ready by the end of 1913, but it only now sees the light,* thanks to the kindness of America. Nor does this fifth volume complete Professor Goldbacher's labours; there is still another volume, the sixth, which we had the pleasure of examining in the MS. form last year in Graz, and which gives a critical text of those letters in the Appendix to the genuine *Epistulæ*, and of these the Pelagian *Ep. ad Demetriadem* will be the most generally welcomed. Dr. Goldbacher undertook the editing of Augustine's *Letters* as far back as 1872, *non satis conscius*, he tells us (*præf.*, p. xciv.), *quantum onus humeris meis sustinere conarer;* whether or not the sixth volume appear, this fifth, the coping-stone, will earn for the veteran scholar, born in the year when Queen Victoria ascended the throne, the hearty gratitude of all Augustinians, present and to come.

The Preface and Table of MSS., covering together over 100 pages, deal in detail with the MSS. used—a topic which the length of this notice precludes from discussion here. Then follow the six indices, covering 426 pages: (i.) Names of writers or recipients of letters; (ii.) the order of the letters in pre-Maurist editions; (iii.) the order and date of the Letters; (iv.) Scriptural and other quotations; (v.) *nominum et rerum;* (vi.) *verborum et locutionum.*

All these indices will be of immense service; for the last we are particularly grateful—the other matters could always be hunted up in the great Index of the Maurist edition, but for the Latinity of the Letters there was, until Sister W. Parsons' *Study of the Vocabulary and Rhetoric of St. Augustine* (Washington, 1923), nothing to which one could refer. The present index will therefore be of the more service, though we may wish it had been as full, say, as that to the Ps.-Aug. *Quæstiones* of Dr. Souter, or Reiter's Jerome on Jeremiah. There is no need here to enter into detail or suggest improvements; *talis qualis*, this index is a useful piece of work, a valuable addition to our tools, and our thanks for it are sincere and hearty.

* The volume is dated 1923, but appears only in March, 1924. I owe a copy to Dr. Goldbacher's kindness.

There are no *addenda* or *corrigenda* to the text as completed by the editor in 1911, which, if regrettable—for even yet the Letters leave room for textual improvement and correction—at least saves the time of referring backwards and forwards from one volume to another. As it is, Dr. Goldbacher has fully earned our gratitude; his five volumes are a monument of patient, careful labour, continued over a length of time few scholars can hope to equal. And there is no doubt that as the work has taken long to make, it will have long to live.

J. H. Baxter.

---

Savonarola: Ein Kulturbild aus der Zeit der Renaissance. Von J. Schnitzer. Mit Holzschnitten und 32 Tafeln. 2 Baende. Verlag Ernst Reinhardt, Munich. 1924. Band I.: Savonarola's Leben, 599 Seiten; Band II.: Savonarola's Ideen, 567 Seiten. Preis, 30 goldmark net.

There is nowadays a certain confusion of ideas attached to the name of the great preacher Girolamo Savonarola. We are inclined to think of him as in the first place a gloomy inquisitor, a man of fanatical temperament who was hostile to art and culture, and who would willingly have annihilated the artistry and the joy of life we associate with the Florence of the Medici. Or we are accustomed to picture him as a Protestant at a time when Protestantism was not yet formally in existence, as an outspoken opponent of papal claims and doctrines, an Italian forerunner of Luther overcome ultimately by the accumulated force of circumstances.

In doing this, however, we, in fact, combine two entirely different conceptions of Savonarola, each of which has its distinct historical origin. The first, that of Savonarola the obscurantist, goes back to the age of enlightenment, whose protagonists could see nothing in a convinced, penitential preacher but a fool or an impostor. The other, which regards him as a Protestant, goes back to the time of the Reformation, when the Lutherans claimed him as their own. Till in our own times these two currents unite. But in reality the prior of San Marco was neither the grotesque fanatic that he appeared to Goethe, nor the convinced enemy of the Roman papacy that he appeared to the Protestant theologians.

It is true that the nineteenth century did not leave these two conceptions untouched. Sixty years ago the Italian historian Pasquale Villari wrote a masterly and famous biography of Savonarola which has been translated into English, in which he put an end to these legends so far as the scientific world is concerned; but he immediately created another one in their stead. For to Villari the Dominican monk was not in essence an opponent of the Renaissance spirit, but one of its most brilliant representatives. Savonarola was "the first who sought to reconcile belief with reason, religion with freedom," Villari writes in the general summing-up at the end of his biography of Savonarola. For him Savonarola was the heroic exponent of a new freedom, of a *republican* Catholicism—*i.e.*, Savonarola appears in this biography in the light of an Italian patriot, such as Villari and his contemporaries in the age of Italian aspirations towards freedom would have liked to find amongst the Italian clergy.

Herr Josef Schnitzer, professor of religious history in Munich University, has already written some smaller works upon the Savonarola

problem, and in the two substantial volumes now published we have the results of twenty-five years' labour. He visualizes the great preacher anew. He does not, like Villari, regard him primarily in the light of a tribune of the people, though he became such on certain historical occasions; nor does he, like the same Italian historian, regard him as "a Columbus in the world of spirit." He seeks rather to present Savonarola's nature in the aspect which for Savonarola himself meant the sole sense and object of his existence, that of a man passionately desirous to reawaken in the clergy and in the laity a religious zeal that was in danger of extinction and an ideal of pure and Christian life. If political preoccupations led Villari to present Brother Girolamo as a Mazzini in a Dominican cowl, in this later biography the figure of Savonarola takes on something of the dignity and the rôle of an Isaiah or a Jeremiah.

And it is, in fact, only upon the assumption that Savonarola touched these deeper sources of inspiration that we can account for his enormous influence upon a people so volatile and frivolous as the Florentines. He drew his strength from just this consciousness of a prophetic mission. He believed that he was sent from God, and that to him more than to other men it was vouchsafed to pierce the veil of the future. And in a vision he saw in the clouds of heaven a hand with a threatening outstretched sword, with the inscription, *Gladius cito et velociter.* Like the prophets of Israel, on whose writings he based a series of sermons, he announced the approaching judgment of God. He declared that God would lead a prince over the Alps to Italy, and open the gates of the towns to him, a prophecy which events fulfilled. The prince came. Charles VIII. of France penetrated as far as Naples without meeting with resistance, and it was the political shock caused by his appearance that led to the downfall of the Medici régime in Florence.

In those disturbed times Savonarola, like the great seers of Jerusalem and like many another preacher of his time, became also the political adviser of the people. In the presence of the fourteen or even fifteen thousand people, who were accustomed to listen devoutly to his sermons, he unfolded a programme for the pacific settlement of the constitutional crisis in Florence on the basis of a democracy in which the power should be in the hands of the middle and upper classes, on the lines indicated by Venice. But the real object of Savonarola remained as before the purification of the Christian world, and in particular of Florence, from the moral corruption he saw spreading everywhere. He had no means to effect this, but the power of his spoken words and the magnetism of his personality. He had no torturers at his disposal to enforce his will upon recalcitrants, as Calvin at a later period had in Geneva. Nor was his object simply a return to a pious barbarism. He has frequently been abused as the enemy of all art, but it is remarkable that he made a deep impression upon many of the Florentine artists themselves, and exercised a positive influence upon their art. Botticelli, Fra Bartolomeo, and others confessed themselves his disciples.

Savonarola's downfall and his death were the outcome of many and complicated factors. The machinations of the Florentine oligarchy against the popular preacher, the resistance of a young and vicious fashionable world to his moral reforms, the intrigues of envious and offended monks in Rome, and the policy of a pope who was animated exclusively by worldly considerations, all these led to Savonarola's

downfall. They formed a medley of religious, social, and political forces, and Schnitzer's book brings them vividly and unsparingly before the eyes of the reader.

The chaotic financial conditions in Germany of late years have often been reflected in the poor get-up of many German books that have appeared lately. It is greatly to the credit of the publisher that he has overcome these difficulties, and produced a book that can hold its own in any library.

RICHMOND LENNOX.

---

CATHOLICISM AND ROMAN CATHOLICISM. Three Addresses delivered in Grosvenor Chapel in Advent, 1922, by Charles Gore, D.D. Mowbray.

CONSTANTINOPLE, CANTERBURY, AND ROME. A Criticism of Bishop Gore's Theory of the Catholic Church, by the Rev. F. Woodlock, S.J. Longmans.

Bishop Gore's addresses are entitled "Catholicism," "Roman Catholicism," and "Protestantism and Anglicanism" respectively. In the first he deals with the Catholic idea of the Church as being in accordance with New Testament teaching. In the second he treats of the Roman development of that idea, and shows that Rome "has been the chief spiritual misleader of Europe." The third address is occupied with the strength and the weakness of Protestantism, and with the position of the Anglican Church, for which, in spite of its manifest failings, a special divine purpose clearly appears.

Fr. Woodlock's book is longer and more elaborate. It consists of five lectures, occasioned by the above Advent series of addresses, but really forming a reply to Bishop Gore's whole theory of the Church as expounded in several of his works. Fr. Woodlock traverses once more much of the old familiar ground. He seems to postulate that private judgment is never to be trusted, except when it leads to the true Church. He makes great play with the divisions and lack of discipline in the Anglican Church, and with its tolerance of modernist teaching. He discusses at length the validity of Anglican Orders, and his conclusion is "Causa finita est! Rome will never re-open the question. Re-union . . . involves acquiescence in this decision."

E. L. HUNTER.

---

WHO'S WHO IN THE EARLY CHURCH. By W. C. Piercy. Faith Press. 7s. 6d.

What an attractive title for a miniature *Dictionary of Christian Biography!* Mr. Piercy, who has already produced with Dr. Wace a one-volume "D.C.B.," puts us further in his debt by this new book. To bring his material within the compass of a book of 128 pages was, indeed, a thankless task. Much of value had to be omitted. The Preface sufficiently explains the principles of selection. The literary activities of early Christians, and their significance for the present day, and for the English Church, have been the main criteria. One serious omission is that of heretics. A dictionary which omits not only Marcion and Valentinus, but men like Novatian and Nestorius, is gravely defective. The inclusion of Merlin, or St. Medard of Noyon (known mainly through Ingoldsby Legends), does not make up for the loss. The author is evidently not quite happy about it, for he explains in the Preface that

heretics and schismatics are omitted by direction of the editor of the series, and will, it is hoped, be dealt with in another volume. But it is bad reviewing to quarrel with a book because it is not something else which the author never intended to write, and we therefore conclude by thanking Mr. Piercy very warmly for his labours and the many references to recent patristic literature in English.

W. K. L. CLARKE.

---

RELIGION, PHILOSOPHY AND HISTORY. Four Lectures by Thomas B. Strong, Bishop of Ripon. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d. net.

The Bishop in these lectures gives us an example of the art of compression which we only wish we could successfully imitate in a review notice. To attempt to summarize a summary is quite hopeless. We must content ourselves with saying that the Bishop's little book is packed with thought and amounts to outlines of a Christian philosophy. It ought certainly to be read by all Catholics who wish for guiding lines in the effort to hold fast the Deposit of Faith in the midst of modern philosophical speculation and rival "world-views," antagonistic to the Christians. The book ought not to be missed also by that small group of men who are really alive to the issues at stake in the present relations of religion and modern speculative philosophies and who are striving to discover a foundation upon which a distinctive Christian Philosophy may be built up. Dr. Strong takes his stand upon the fact that Christianity is rooted in history. The full implications of this position have yet to be developed. We hope that the lectures before us may be the prelude to another volume aiming at a comprehensive constructive effort at a Christian Philosophy by one of the few modern Bishops capable of attempting the task.

H. MAURICE RELTON.

---

## BOOK NOTES

*The Christ of the Gospels.* By A. W. Robinson. S.C.M. 3s. paper, 4s. 6d. cloth. Canon Robinson has made a great reputation by his simple and very attractively written books on religious subjects, and the latest will fully maintain this reputation. The treatment is inevitably slight, so few pages and so great a subject, but a great deal of thought lies behind the limpid style of these chapters. Like others of the older Cambridge scholars, Canon Robinson remains faithful to the influences of his youth and especially to the Three—Lightfoot, Westcott and Hort. One is inclined to question whether this really honours their memory. Dr. Hort, especially, could we imagine him still amongst us and endowed with perennial youth, would certainly be among the pioneers. It is hard to think of him as not having advanced before the standpoint of Westcott's St. John. Canon Robinson's Conservatism is definitely that of an older generation. It is not that of one who has faced the newer critical problems. And though we have no quarrel with his conclusions, we think the students for whom the book is intended will be less impressed by them when their friends in the theological school question, as they inevitably will, some of the arguments by which the conclusions are reached. *Commentarius in Actus Apostolorum.* Editio septima. Opera A. Camerlynck et A. Vander Heeren. Brugis. 1923. This scholarly

commentary on the Acts is interesting to an English reader as showing the excellent scholarship of Catholic Belgium and the possibility of using Latin as a living language. *New Guide to the Holy Land.* By Fr. Barnabas Meistermann. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 10s. 6d. This splendid book will have a warm welcome among Anglicans. We have Bp. Parry's *A Pilgrim in Jerusalem,* written with equal reverence and rather more caution as to traditional sites, but nothing corresponding to it for the rest of Palestine. It is a Baedeker and a pilgrim's *vade mecum* in one. Running to over 700 closely printed pages and containing 23 maps, 17 plans of towns, and 101 plans of buildings, mainly Churches, it is very good value for money. The Vulgate spellings, such as Cariathiarim or Thecoa, are puzzling at first to a reader familiar with the Authorized Version, but this is a small matter. Naturally Latin Christianity in Palestine receives more attention than Greek, and occasionally the latter might be treated more sympathetically, but there is no serious ground for complaint. It is unfortunate that just when Prof. Macalister's excavations make it clear that the City of David was on the S.E. hill, Fr. Meistermann's plans, following Conder, show it on the S.W. hill. Those who have neither time nor money to go on pilgrimage to Palestine will derive much benefit, if they have a vivid enough imagination, from a visit paid mentally and spiritually with the help of this book. *The Life Purposeful.* By Jesse Brett. 5s. Mr. Brett was privileged to guide many devout persons by his writings, and now that he has passed from the Church militant his circle of readers will cherish this last volume from his pen. It is very simple but nevertheless deep. *The Three Sacraments of Initiation.* By L. Labauche. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 10s. 6d. We think many outside the Roman obedience will be glad to know of this 500-page book, beautifully arranged, most clearly written, and very complete, dealing with Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist. History, liturgy, dogma, and discipline—down to the latest decisions of Rome—are all here. Among the interesting details we note the conditions under which in the Mission Field a priest may administer Confirmation. In the East he may by delegation from the bishop; in the Roman Church by delegation from the Pope (in the Anglican Communion never). In Spain, we read, Confirmation of infants immediately after baptism has always been customary. "Time and again the Holy Office has allowed missionaries to use a raisin wine made under the following conditions. The dried raisins must be placed in cold water for seven, eight or ten hours at the most; the surplus water should then be poured off and the raisins dried and pressed" (p. 350). *The Town Parson: His Life and Work.* By Peter Green. Longmans. 6s. Canon Green's lectures on Pastoralia, published in 1919, have appeared in a second edition. They are very valuable and to be recommended to all. The author takes the opportunity to prefix an exceedingly strong and heart-searching Preface. Church life is dying at the roots for neglect of parish work, due to the shortage of clergy, the pressure of organization, and the attraction of posts other than pastoral. If a Curate makes his mark he is taken to be "'Commissioner for the North-West District of England' to 'organize the home base' for service abroad," or "Travelling Secretary for the Society for Summer Schools for the application of psycho-analysis to Confirmation classes." The remedy is chiefly "a new vision, on the part of the younger generation, of the worth, the dignity, and the happiness of pastoral work." W. K. L. C.

# INDEX TO VOLUME VIII

## JANUARY—JUNE, 1924


PAGES

Anglican Evangelical Group Movement . . . . . 283
Atonement, The . . . . . 20, 139
Authority and Freedom. Review, the Editor . . . . . 304
Babylonian Literature, Recent Discoveries in . . . . . 2, 67, 123, 190
BADCOCK, F. J., St. Paul's Apostolic Commission . . . . . 13, 79
BAKER, A. E., The Christian Mystery . . . . . 246
BINNS, L. ELLIOTT, Anglican Evangelical Group Movement . . . . 283
Books Noticed:
Abiding Presence, The . . . . . 300
Acts of the Apostles, The (Codex Bezæ). By J. M. Wilson . . . . 46
Alexander Whyte, Life of. By G. F. Barbour . . . . . 233
Amos, The Book of. By T. H. Robinson . . . . . 293
Anglo-Catholicism and Reunion. By S. H. Scott . . . . . 60
An Anglo-Catholic's Thoughts on Religion. By G. C. Rawlinson . . . 292
Apocalypse of St. John. By M. G. Glazebrooke . . . . . 116
Apollinarianism. By C. E. Raven . . . . . 171
Apostelgeschichte des Lucas. By T. Zahn . . . . . 46
Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought. By F. Garvin . . 168
Authority. By T. B. Strong . . . . . 240
Authority and Freedom, by A. E. J. Rawlinson . . . . . 304
Causes of the Present Conflict of Ideals in the Church of England. By R. D. Richardson . . . . . 239, 303
Century of Anglican Theology, A. By C. C. J. Webb . . . . . 117
Christian Beliefs and Modern Questions. By O. C. Quick . . . . 177
Christian Monism. By E. Wasman . . . . . 296
Christianity and the Religions of the World. By A. Schweitzer . . . 59
Churchman's Glossary of Ecclesiastical Terms, The. By E. G. C. F. Atchley and E. G. P. Wyatt . . . . . .
Confessions of St. Augustine, The . . . . . 297
Design Argument Reconsidered. By C. J. Shebbeare and J. McCabe . . 237
Dialogues on Metaphysics. By Malebranche . . . . . 14
Divinity of Christ in the New Testament, The. By H. Williams . . . 55
English Church Music, Manual of. By G. Gardner and S. H. Nicholson . . 53
Failure of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament, The. By A. Phillips . 58
First Notions of Holy Writ. By C. Lattey . . . . . 293
Holy Spirit and the Church. By C. Gore . . . . . 301
Idea of the Holy, The. By R. Otto . . . . . 230
Idea of Revelation, The. By W. R. Matthews . . . . . 298
In and Around the Book of Daniel. By C. Boutflower . . . . . 178
Influence of the Church on Moral Problems, The . . . . . 294
Introduction au Nouveau Testament, Les Actes. By M. Goguel . . . 46
Is Christian Experience an Illusion ? By H. Balmforth . . . . 238
Jesus and Civil Government. By A. T. Cadoux . . . . . 294
King Hezekiah. By W. H. T. Gairdner . . . . . 289
Large Room, A. By S. C. Carpenter . . . . . 60
L'Énigme de Jésus. By P. L. Couchoud . . . . . 118
Loaves and Fishes. By Bernard Vaughan . . . . . 298
Macrobius. By Th. Whittaker . . . . . 57
Ministerial Commission. By C. S. Carter . . . . . 59
Mithraism and Christianity. By L. Pattison . . . . . 119
Monastic Chronicler, The. By C. Jenkins . . . . . 113
Moral Theology. By F. J. Hall . . . . . 285
Mystical Initiation. By C. Louisement . . . . . 297
Necessity of Art, The. By Clutton Brock, etc. . . . . .
New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's. By A. H. McNeile . 297
Prayer-Book Revision and Christian Reunion. By F. C. Eeles . . . 112
Prière de Toutes les Heures, La. By P. Charles . . . . . 299
Prophetic Consciousness, The. By M. D. R. Willink . . . . . 290
Psychological and Poetic Approach to Study of Christ. By Eva Gore-Booth . 295
Religion and Natural Law. By C. F. Russell . . . . . 240
Religion since the Reformation. By L. Pullan . . . . . 49
Revelation, Book of. By J. Oman . . . . . 116
Roadmending on the Sacred Way. By J. M. C. Crum . . . . . 238
Robe sans Couture, La. By P. Charles . . . . . 119
St. Dunstan, The Times of. By J. A. Robinson . . . . . 117
St. Paul on Trial. By J. I. Still . . . . . 53

Books Noticed (*continued*)— PAGES
St. Peter, His Name and Office. By T. W. Allies . . . . . 58
Select Passages illustrating Neoplatonism. By E. R. Dodds . . . . 299
Significance of Life, The. By E. F. Champness . . . . . 298
Spirit and Personality. By W. S. Bishop . . . . . 59
Studies in the Christian Gospel for Society. By H. A. Mess . . . . 181
Spiritual Healing. By H. Anson . . . . . 112
Summa Contra Gentiles . . . . . 345
Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of His Age, The. By T. Walker . 300
Texte des Nuene Testaments, Der. By A. Potts . . . . . 46
Thomas de Cobham. By the Bishop of Worcester . . . . . 54
Three Measures of Meal. By F. G. Vial . . . . . 180
Through Prayer to Peace. By C. M. Whishaw . . . . . 300
Tutankhamen and Egyptology. By S. A. B. Mercer . . . . . 297
Uniate Eastern Churches, The. By Adrian Fortescue . . . . . 176
Way of the Church, The. By K. D. MacKenzie . . . . . 294
Whole Tithe, The. By P. W. Thompson . . . . . 58
Bouquet, Dr., Odes of Solomon . . . . . 197
Bullard, J. V., Revision of Canon Law . . . . . 261
Burn, Dr. A. E. . . . . 317
Burrowes, A. B., Dr. Johnson and the Scottish Church . . . . . 216
Canon Law, Revision of . . . . . 261
Christian Gospel for Society . . . . . 181
Christian Mystery, The . . . . . 246
Clarke, Archbishop . . . . . 329
Clarke, W. K. L., Evangelical Catholicism, Review . . . . . 100
Clarke, W. K. L., Western Text of Acts . . . . . 46
Clarke, W. K. L., In the Study . . . . . 162, 281
Considerations on Liberty . . . . . 321
Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought . . . . . 168
Dr. Johnson and the Scottish Church . . . . . 216
Driver, G. R., Recent Discoveries in Babylonian Literature . . 2, 67, 123, 190
Editorial . . . . . 1, 61, 121, 181, 241, 301
Election of Bishops in the Church in Wales . . . . . 337
Evangelical Catholicism . . . . . 100
French Theology, Recent . . . . . 42
Gospel of Life, The . . . . . 242, 307
Green, Canon Peter, Sin, Suffering and the Atonement . . . . . 131
Hutton, W. H., Religion since the Reformation, Review . . . . . 49
Invocation in the Eucharist . . . . . 89
In the Study . . . . . 162, 281
Joyce, Dr. G. C. . . . . 337
Kelly, H., S.S.M., The Parish . . . . . 270
Kirk, K. E., Moral Theology, Review . . . . . 285
Lacey May, G., Village Folk and Confession . . . . . 206
Margoliouth, Dr. G. . . . . 228
Milner-White, E., The Value of the English Tradition . . . . . 151
Ministry of Healing Report . . . . . 225
Miscellanea . . . . . 42, 111, 161, 223, 279
Moral Theology . . . . . 285
Norfolk Parish 400 Years Ago, A . . . . . 329
Odes of Solomon . . . . . 197
Parish, The . . . . . 270
Pershore, Abbot of, Recent French Theology . . . . . 42
Pridie, J. R., Notes on Ministry of Healing Report . . . . . 228
Psychology, List of Books . . . . . 282
Richmond, Canon W., Gospel of Life . . . . . 242, 307
Robinson, Dean J. Armitage, Invocation in the Eucharist . . . . . 89
St. Albans, Bishop of, Training and True Priestcraft . . . . . 31
St. Paul's Apostolic Commission . . . . . 13, 79
Selwyn, E. G., Atonement, The . . . . . 20, 139
Sin, Suffering and the Atonement . . . . . 131
Sparrow Simpson, Dr., Recent French Theology . . . . . 43
Sparrow Simpson, Dr., Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought, Review . . 168
Taylor, Prof. A. E., Idea of the Holy, Review . . . . . 230
Taylor, Prof. A. E., Considerations on Liberty . . . . . 321
Training and True Priestcraft . . . . . 31
Value of the English Tradition, The . . . . . 151
Village Folk and Confession . . . . . 206

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER